

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 237

8 December 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR**

USSR To 'Reexamine' START; No Resumption Date	AA 1
U.S. Deployment Justification 'Conscious Deceit'	AA 1
[Linnik in PRAVDA 8 Dec]	
U.S. 'Objections' to Merging INF, START Noted	AA 4
[Orlov]	
Rumors of Soviet INF Resumption 'Deliberate Lies'	AA 5
[Editorial in ZA RUBEZHOM No 49]	
NATO 'Nuclear Blackmail' Strategy Deemed Failure	AA 7
[Dadyants in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 4 Dec]	
Chervov Contrasts SS-20's, 'Strategic' Pershings	AA 10
[Bratislava PRAVDA 6 Dec]	
USSR's 'Resolute' INF Countermeasures Extolled	AA 12
[Kuznetsov in NOVOYE VREMYA No 49]	
Western Reactions to INF Deployment Cited	AA 16

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Session Ends	BB 1
[PRAVDA 8 Dec]	
History of Warsaw Pact Defense Alliance Reviewed	BB 1
[Tyushkevich in Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA 6 Dec]	
CEMA Chemical Industry Panel Meets in Hungary	BB 3
[IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]	

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

NATO Defense Ministers Meeting 'Setback' for U.S.	CC 1
[Kharkov]	
Disunity Perceived Among NATO Nations on Missiles	CC 1
WFTU Condemns U.S. 'Mass Bombing' in Lebanon	CC 2
Reagan's CSCE Report Denounced as 'Pure Lies'	CC 2
[Lyutyy]	

UNITED STATES & CANADA

'Folly' of Reagan's Political Views Satirized	A 1
[Bovin in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 7 Dec]	
Burt Remarks on USSR Eurasian Strategy 'Lies'	A 3
[Kudryavtsev in IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]	

CHINA

U.S. 'Contemptuous Attitude' Toward PRC Decried	B 1
PRC's 'Struggle Against Unemployment' Noted	B 1
[Piskunov in TRUD 3 Dec]	
Correction to Rejoinder on Wu's Kurils Remarks	B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Mongolian People 'Unanimously' Back USSR Policy	C 1
[Dugersuren in PRAVDA 7 Dec]	
MPR Gives 'Total Approval' of Andropov Statement	C 3
USSR's Marchuk Receives Mongolian Counterpart	C 4
[PRAVDA 7 Dec]	

SOUTH ASIA

Bangladesh 'Grim Economic Position,' 'Crisis'	D 1
[Shurygin in PRAVDA 5 Dec]	
USSR-India Economic Links 'Constantly Expanding'	D 2
[Biryukov]	
Reportage on Arkhipov's New Delhi Visit	D 2
[cross-reference]	

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Patolichev Signs Trade Protocol With SRV [PRAVDA 7 Dec]	E 1
---	-----

EASTERN EUROPE

GDR, CSSR Condemn U.S. Deployment in Europe	F 1
CSSR Officials, Cuba's Malmierca Issue Communique	F 1
Opening of MSZMP Central Committee Session Noted	F 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Shultz-Genscher Press Conference Derided	G 1
[Grigoriyev]	
Belgium Said Feeling U.S. Pressure for Deployment	G 1
CPSU, DKP Delegations Hit U.S. 'Militarists'	G 2
[PRAVDA 7 Nov]	
EEC Rift 'Plays Into Washington's Hands'	G 3
[Ponomarev]	
Shitikov Holds 'Frank Exchange' With UK Official	G 4
UK Said Yielding to U.S. on Lebanon Issue	G 4
Koivisto Greeted on Finnish Independence Day	G 5
[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]	
PCI Statement on U.S. Role in Lebanon Cited	G 5

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Egypt Criticizes U.S. Policy in Mideast	H 1
Mubarak Hits U.S.-Israeli Pact	H 1
[Kalyagin]	
Deputy Foreign Minister's Criticism	H 1
[Rassadin]	
PRC 'Strongly Condemns' U.S. Mideast Action	H 1
Shultz Upholds 'Policy of Terror'	H 2
U.S. Uses Troops in Lebanon as 'Trojan Horse'	H 3
[Adrianov]	
U.S., Israel Cooperate in 'Piracy, Pillage'	H 4
U.S. 'Setting Up' RDF Center in Gulf Region	H 4
USSR's Ogarkov Makes 'Friendly Visit' to Algeria	H 5
Departs Moscow [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Dec]	H 5
Talks Begin	H 5
Algerian Reportage	H 6
[cross-reference]	
CPSU's Brutents Meets With Moroccan Leaders	H 6
Discusses Party Ties	H 6
[PRAVDA 7 Dec]	
Addresses Holiday Ceremony	H 6
[PRAVDA 6 Dec]	

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Kuznetsov Presents Award to Cuban Envoy	K 1
[PRAVDA 6 Dec]	
CIA Engineering 'Sabotage' in Nicaragua	K 1
U.S. 'Taking Steps' To Perpetuate Grenada Stay	K 2
[Chigir]	
Barkauskas Departs for Argentina Inauguration	K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session Set for 6 Jan	R 1
Ideological Laxity in Ukrainian Ministry Noted	R 1
[Kapto in PRAVDA 17 Oct]	

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Beketov on Waste of Industrial Material	S 1
Official Notes Delays in Machinery Deliveries	S 1
Economist Views Ways To Improve Capital Use	S 2
[Gorbunov in PRAVDA 1 Dec]	

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Early Dec Weather, Crop Status Reported	T 1
[Pisarenko in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 4 Dec]	
Briefs: Nakhichevan ASSR Agricultural Production	T 1

USSR TO 'REEXAMINE' START; NO RESUMPTION DATE

LD081219 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 8 Dec 83

[Text] Geneva December 8 TASS -- The fifth round of the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments was closed today by a plenary meeting between the Soviet and American delegations. A change in the overall strategic situation due to the beginning of the deployment of new American missiles in Europe compels the Soviet side to re-examine all the issues which are the subject of the discussion at the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments. The date for the resumption of the talks has not been set due to this.

U.S. DEPLOYMENT JUSTIFICATION 'CONSCIOUS DECEIT'

PM081154 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[V. Linnik article: "Screen for Missiles. How Washington Wrecked the Geneva Talks"]

[Text] Certain respectable Western newspapers are evidently mistaken in now complaining that the U.S. Administration supposedly has no "impressive achievements" in the foreign policy sphere. Of course the White House has such "achievements," if such they may be called. And the list of them inspires growing alarm.

Today brazen aggression has been committed against Grenada. Today there is a growing number of victims among the peaceful Lebanese inhabitants dying under fire from American guns and machine guns. Today U.S. Marines and military advisers are dying ingloriously. This has not happened since the U.S. "dirty war" in Indochina.

Today the Pentagon budget is 50 percent bigger than it was before Reagan came to power. Today the United States is producing neutron weapons for deployment in West Europe. The previous administration was forced to suspend these plans under pressure from indignant world public opinion. Prior to Reagan's arrival in the White House it was decided to defer the production of B-1 strategic bombers so as to clear the way, above all, for the MX ICBM of increased accuracy. The present masters of the White House are producing both the MX missile and the B-1 bomber.

Today Washington, having wrecked the Geneva talks and begun deploying its Pershing-II and cruise missiles in West Europe, is imposing on the world a new round of the arms race fraught with unpredictable consequences. "With the deployment of American missiles on European soil," reads the 24 November statement of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, "there will be an increase not in Europe's security but in the real danger that the United States will bring catastrophe upon the peoples of Europe."

Three years ago mankind had a hope that this extremely dangerous turn in international relations could be avoided. Now the U.S. Administration, having begun the deployment of its missiles at launch sites in the FRG, Britain, and Italy and having thereby torpedoed the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe, is intending to take that hope away from mankind.

This kind of "track record" is not just "achievement" with a minus sign. It is a concrete expression of the political course of those most reactionary imperialist circles which are prepared to take the world to the brink of nuclear war in the name of asserting their supremacy.

Washington cannot fail to see that its militarist policy is inspiring a growing sense of alarm in an ever increasing number of people on earth. The White House also realizes that deception of absolutely everyone, daily and nightly deception, is the only chance this policy has of succeeding.

The Western press recently made public some secret documents adopted at a meeting of the leaders of the United States, Britain, France, and the FRG in Guadeloupe in January 1979. Even at that time the shepherds of the "free world," preparing to adopt the December NATO nuclear missile decision, foresaw the indignant public reaction in their countries. In this connection they envisaged an active campaign to influence public opinion in the United States and West Europe.

Today the White House is pushing the idea that there is supposedly nothing at all dangerous in the U.S. desire for nuclear superiority. The United States, it is said, had such superiority in the forties and fifties and yet did not attack the Soviet Union. However, we are well aware that it was precisely during those years that Pentagon staffs drew up some half a dozen misanthropic plans for a nuclear attack on the USSR and were restrained from implementing them not least by the fact that at that time the United States still did not possess sufficient nuclear potential for destruction. And as for the existence of "goodwill" on the other side of the ocean, the world remembers too well that the United States is the only country in the history of mankind to have used nuclear weapons, and, what is more, not on the battlefield but against peaceful inhabitants. The intervention in Grenada and the barbarous bombing and artillery shelling of Lebanese villages and cities have also said a great deal about Washington's "morality."

Falsity has become the state seal of the present administration. Everything has become sham, and the essence of objects and phenomena has been distorted to the utmost.

The White House is making a special propaganda effort to justify the deployment of 108 Pershing II and 464 cruise missiles which has begun.

Attempts are being made over and over again to lift from themselves the responsibility for wrecking the Geneva talks. The long since debunked myth of the U.S. "flexibility" displayed at these talks continues to be repeated. In fact, the so-called "initiatives" advanced by the U.S. Administration at the Geneva talks were not even worth the paper on which they were written, for the purpose of all their versions -- the "zero," "interim," and "modernized" options -- is to undermine the established approximate equilibrium of nuclear forces on the European Continent and to clear the way to military superiority for the Pentagon and NATO.

Having begun the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles, Washington is once again trying to present the United States as the "laggard" side which has therefore been "forced to respond" to the Soviet Union's deployment of SS-20 medium-range missiles. If this does not correspond to the facts, so much the worse for the facts -- this is evidently how the White House reasons. Let us start with the fact that it was not Soviet but American systems that were the first medium-range nuclear means in Europe. Back in the mid-fifties the United States began turning West Europe into a nuclear depot by creating so-called "forward-based means." At approximately the same time certain other NATO member countries also acquired nuclear weapons. Soviet SS-4 and SS-5 medium-range missiles were deployed on USSR territory several years later as a response to the threat created in Europe by that American and NATO nuclear potential.

SS-20 missiles appeared in the Soviet Union's arsenal in the late seventies. They were a modernization of the obsolete SS-4 and SS-5 missiles, which had been developed back in the fifties. The new missiles did not change the approximate equilibrium of forces in Europe or create a critical situation.

The point is that for every two newly installed SS-20 missiles the USSR simultaneously removed three SS-4 and SS-5 missiles. Furthermore, the yield of the latter's charges exceeds the yield of the SS-20. Before the SS-20 deployment began, we had approximately 600 missiles in the west, but now we have only 473. The total yield of all their charges has been reduced by a factor of 1.7 [umenshilas v 1.7 raza]. As Western specialists admit, SS-20 missiles cannot be regarded as first-strike weapons and still less as strategic weapons, since they cannot reach U.S. territory. Thus, a critical situation is being created on the European Continent not by SS-20's but by the new American medium-range missiles, which sharply alter the strategic situation and increase danger.

The farfetched nature of the thesis that the United States is supposedly merely "responding" -- carrying out "arms upgrading" -- to the USSR's "overarmament" is also confirmed by other facts.... The United States, for example, adopted the decision on the mass production of cruise missiles in 1972 and on the deployment of Pershing II's in West Europe in 1975, that is, several years before any SS-20 missiles appeared in the Soviet Union's arsenal at all. Moreover, believing that it would succeed in ensuring superiority in nuclear means in Europe for a long time, the United States stubbornly refused any talks with the USSR on these types of arms throughout the seventies.

Being highly accurate and having a flight time of 608 minutes to the target and a flight range of 2,500 km, the Pershing II's will be targeted -- and this is confirmed by a report from military circles -- first and foremost on the highest organs of administration and other strategic targets in the Soviet Union. These missiles are regarded as a substantial addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear potential, which they wish to endow with the capacity for a so-called "disarming" nuclear strike. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has stated frankly that the Pershing II and cruise missiles will enable the United States to "win a nuclear war." The Western press admits that the SS-20's are no more than a pretext for the siting of American missiles.

It is also the political purpose of the deployment of cruise missiles to make any nuclear arms limitation agreement unverifiable, which accords fully with the true intentions of the present U.S. Administration. Moreover, the 112 such missiles which it is intended to site in Sicily will be able to keep the Mediterranean, North Africa, and the Near East in their sights.

One of the most irksome, extravagant propaganda theses repeated by various people in the administration, including its chief, is that the Soviet Union did not observe the moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear means on the European part of its territory, but supposedly deployed one such missile there every week. U.S. President R. Reagan reiterated this lie during the very days when the Pentagon was beginning to site its own new missiles in the FRG and Britain.

Such assertions are flagrant slander of the USSR, whose leadership repeatedly declared the Soviet Union's strict observance of the moratorium. Not only did the USSR adhere to the moratorium, it even reduced its medium-range nuclear arms in Europe. Whereas at the beginning of last year the Soviet Union had 975 medium-range nuclear delivery vehicles sited in Europe, on 1 October 1983 it had 938 units of this type of arms. In particular, the SS-5 missiles have been entirely withdrawn and dismantled. It was only when the United States started shipping Pershing II and cruise missiles to West Europe that the Soviet leadership adopted the decision to lift the moratorium.

Reassuring sentences are also emanating from the White House -- again in order to deceive anxious West Europeans -- to the effect that the Soviet Union will return to the Geneva conference table, if not today, then tomorrow, despite the deployment of American missiles.

This is cynical, deliberate misrepresentation. To attribute to the USSR readiness to continue the former talks, as if nothing had happened, to the accompaniment of the installation of American missiles in West Europe is not only to pass off your wishes as reality, but deliberately to mislead the world public. Our country's stance on this question is unambiguous. It was clearly stated by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov: "If the United States and the other NATO countries display readiness to return to the situation which existed before the start of the siting of American medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union will also be prepared."

The propaganda tactics of the American rulers toward their own people are still those of conscious deceit. Here too there is no room for ambiguity. It should be stressed that the Soviet means being deployed in ocean regions and seas, having in view the territory of the United States itself, will be equivalent in terms of their characteristics to the threat created for us and our allies by the American missiles being sited in Europe, in terms of range, might, accuracy, and -- what is particularly important -- flight time to target.

The West is now trying to interpret the USSR's retaliatory measures as having supposedly been planned in advance and being unrelated to the deployment of American missiles in Europe. This is another Washington lie. The USSR's retaliatory measures were forced upon it. If there were no U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles on the old continent, there would be no countermeasures of ours. The Soviet Union is opposed in principle to rivalry in the production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction, and would not, of course, wish to consider the situation which has been created as irreversible. An end must and can be put to the arms race.

U.S. 'OBJECTIONS' TO MERGING INF, START NOTED

LD071434 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Igor Orlov writes:

Western press correspondents report from the NATO Headquarters in Brussels, where a series of NATO defence ministers' meetings is being currently held, that high ranking representatives of those countries are "racking their brains" in search of a "key" or a "formula" by means of which they would be able to "return" the Soviet Union to the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. Meanwhile such a formula exists, and it is an open secret not only for the high-ranking representatives of the USA and NATO, but also for the widest world public circles. It is an explicit and logical formula.

Should the USA and the other NATO countries show readiness to return to the situation, which existed prior to the commencement of the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union will be also prepared to do so.

The Soviet Union's stand has been clearly stated in the Soviet leadership's official statements. It proceeds from the premise that the present U.S. Administration by no means wished nor did it desire to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. From the very outset Washington deliberately led things not to success but to failure of the Geneva talks, as it needed talks only as a screen, as a cover for the preparation of its plans for the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe. Continuing the talks under the conditions when the USA started the deployment of its missiles would mean helping deceive the world public.

As for all sorts of ideas, as regards the possibility to "unite" or "merge" in any form the talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe and the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons, which are the subject of speculation

in the U.S. and West European press, it shall be only reminded that at both talks it is precisely the U.S. stand on the essence of the questions under examination that blocks reaching an agreement. It must be noted, for that matter, that as is reported today from the same NATO Headquarters in Brussels, Richard Perle, U.S. Assistant secretary of defence, international security policy, clearly said that the leaders of the U.S. Administration object to "merging" the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and on strategic weapons. The same viewpoint, as THE WASHINGTON POST reported today, has been expressed by Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

RUMORS OF SOVIET INF RESUMPTION 'DELIBERATE LIES'

PMO71614 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 49 (Signed to Press 1 Dec 83) p 1

[Editorial: "A Firm Answer"]

[Text] The entire world has given deep attention to the statement by Yu.V. Andropov general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the decisions taken by the Soviet leadership in connection with the fact that the siting of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles in the European Continent is becoming a "fait accompli."

Harsh Truth

Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's statement contains the harsh truth about the danger which the U.S. policy of deploying first-strike missiles brings to the peoples of Europe and the U.S. people. It also proves convincingly that the FRG, British, and Italian Governments, by actively assisting in the installation of U.S. missiles despite the will of their own peoples, share with the U.S. Administration the entire responsibility for the consequences of this shortsighted policy, earlier warnings of which were given by the Soviet Union.

The orderly system of reasoning and arguments contained in the statement has fully demolished the clever fabrications by NATO propaganda. Striving to deceive and confuse the West European peoples, it passionately argued to prove that the Soviet demand to take British and French medium-range missiles into account is unjustified and strenuously tried to create the impression that the Geneva talks would not be broken off after the siting of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe.

Numerous statements were made that the talks would supposedly be given a new boost with the start of the deployment of U.S. missiles and would become more productive. On the other hand, the Soviet Union's readiness to destroy the missiles that have been cut back was being described as a "concession" which would be followed by additional ones provided the West maintains the "necessary firmness," in other words continues its blackmail.

The Soviet Union has frustrated the U.S. calculations of using the Geneva talks as camouflage for its efforts to disturb the prevailing equilibrium and attain nuclear superiority. The Soviet Union firmly declared the impossibility of its further participation in these talks.

The moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range nuclear means in the European USSR, unilaterally imposed earlier by the Soviet Union, has been lifted. Preparatory work on the siting of increased-range operational-tactical missiles in GDR and CSSR territory, which started some time ago, are being accelerated with the agreement of the GDR and CSSR Governments.

And finally, insofar as the United States is increasing the nuclear threat against the Soviet Union by siting its missiles in Europe, corresponding Soviet means will be deployed in the ocean regions and seas. In terms of their specifications, these means of ours will be commensurate with the threat created for us and our allies by the U.S. missiles.

Now that the Soviet Union's measures in response are becoming reality, the U.S. ruling circles are attempting to hide their dismay by propaganda declarations meant to play down the dangerous consequences of the Reagan administration's actions for the European countries and for the United States itself. Nevertheless, no matter how many pompous words are spoken now in Washington on the subject of "consolidating America's security," facts remain facts: The more this security is sought along the path of stepping up the arms race, that much more of a mirage it becomes.

Illusory Calculations

The measures taken in response by the Soviet leadership render completely groundless Washington's adventurist calculations that it may attain a drastic change in the correlation of nuclear forces to its advantage. This is precisely why such great attention was given both to Yu. V. Andropov's statement itself and to the military measures announced in it regarding the U.S. territory. It is completely natural that the emergence of a fundamentally new and more dangerous situation in the world as a result of the wrecking of the Geneva talks by the United States and the start of the siting of U.S. missiles in Europe has caused alarm among all who are really interested in preserving and strengthening international peace. Under such conditions, the Reagan administration is forced to maneuver. By deliberately distorting the true state of affairs it is attempting to exonerate itself of responsibility for the further exacerbation of the international situation.

In particular, it tries to convince the Americans that it is providing a guarantee of U.S. security by siting in West Europe its first-strike missiles targeted on the Soviet Union's political and command centers. In actual fact, when deploying its missiles close to the Soviet Union's borders, the Reagan administration is in no way thinking of U.S. "security." Its goal is to break the approximate equilibrium of military forces and tilt the scales in its favor. Well-known U.S. professor Stanley Hoffman is, of course, utterly right in noting that "the Reagan administration has brought along a ruthless, all-embracing strategy aimed at acquiring nuclear superiority, conducting ideological, political, and economic war, changing the worldwide correlation of forces -- all at Moscow's expense -- and at removing from Soviet-American competition the elements of cooperation, limited though they may be, but ones whose preservation and expansion was pursued by all former U.S. presidents, at least the ones since Eisenhower."

Rumors are circulating in Washington that the Soviet Union broke off its participation in the talks only for tactical reasons and that, supposedly, it will return to the Geneva talks following a brief break. It is clear that such claims cannot be described otherwise than as deliberate lies. The Soviet Union is really prepared, as before, for businesslike and constructive talks, but only on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security for the sides. This was emphasized yet again with total determination in Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's statement. The Soviet Union has declared its adherence to the principled course of ending the arms race and primarily the nuclear arms race. Just as before, it advocates the most radical solution to the question of nuclear arms in Europe and is striving to render Europe totally free of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical.

The alternative to the nuclear threat created by the Reagan administration's policy for its own people and the peoples of other countries has been formulated not by it but by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Soviet Union is convinced, Yu. V. Andropov stressed, that peace can be strengthened and the people's security guaranteed not by stockpiling ever newer types of weapons but, on the contrary, by reducing the existing weapons to immeasurably lower levels. Mankind is faced with many tasks which cannot be going unresolved simply because colossal material, intellectual, and other resources are being diverted. From this viewpoint, the reaching of agreement on the real reduction of nuclear and other arms would be beneficial for all peoples in our planet.

The reckless actions by the incumbent U.S. Administration have now well and truly raised the temperature of the international situation. Under such conditions it is not easy to advance along the path of detente, cooperation, peaceful coexistence, and disarmament. But the Soviet Union has no intention of retreating from its peace policy.

The Soviet leadership declares that fulfilling the will of the Soviet people, it will continue to do everything in order to avert the threat of war and preserve peace for today's and the future generations.

NATO 'NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL' STRATEGY DEEMED FAILURE

PM071153 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 4 Dec 83 p 3

[Own International Observer G. Dadyants article: "Failure of the Policy of Nuclear Blackmail"]

[Text] President Reagan and his entourage are still putting a brave face on a sorry business and assuring their NATO allies that the USSR is about to return to the talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. P. Nitze, the head of the U.S. delegation at the talks that have been broken off, is touring West European countries, informing the worried allies that the United States "is waiting patiently in Geneva" for the resumption of the talks. Official optimists from the State Department even name the approximate date for the "Russians' return to Geneva" -- January 1984.

This is a new wave in the lying, hypocritical campaign designed to delude public opinion and aimed at trying to take the heat out of the massive antimissile movement that has enveloped West Europe. Its tasks are still the same -- to facilitate the delivery of Pershing II and cruise missiles to West European bases.

During the 2 years that the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons continued, U.S. leaders led the inhabitants of West Europe by the nose, declaring that their immutable goal is the desire to reach agreement with the Soviet Union. At the same time, U.S. propaganda told unpardonable lies and intimidated West Europeans with the Soviet Union's "super-weapons," the special "destabilizing" force of the SS-20 missiles, and so forth.

As for the tactics of the American delegation at the Geneva talks, these were determined by the long-term strategic task: to secure at all costs military-strategic superiority over the USSR on a global scale and NATO superiority over the Warsaw Pact in Europe.

At first the U.S. delegation tried to obtain the destruction of the Soviet missiles, knowing full well that they are merely a counterbalance to U.S. nuclear means located in Europe, and also to the nuclear weapons of the U.S. NATO allies -- Britain and France. This goal was served by Reagan's so-called "zero option," which proposed zero missiles for the USSR and zero reductions for the United States. U.S. nuclear-capable aircraft were not taken into account.

When it became clear that it would not be possible to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union in that way, the Americans steered a course toward the breakdown of the talks and their transformation into a screen for preparations to deploy their own nuclear missiles on the continent. It is for this reason that the U.S. side rejected all the far-reaching Soviet initiatives in this sphere -- right up to the very latest one, namely to limit the number of Soviet missiles to 140, which is approximately equal in strike power to the number of British and French missiles.

One of the chief instruments of the breakdown of the Geneva talks was precisely the question of the British and French nuclear forces. It was alleged that they are "independent," "not comparable with the SS-20's in terms of performance," "strategic," not medium-range, and so forth. Even French President F. Mitterrand, one of the chief apologists for the deployment of U.S. missiles in West European countries, was forced to admit the absurdity of this position recently. He said that "Euromissiles" are missiles which cannot fly across the Atlantic -- which is what the French "deterrent" means trained on targets in the Soviet Union are, incidentally.

In recent months the Geneva talks were a plain mockery of common sense. They no longer served the cause of disarmament but that of armament and became a cover for the U.S. plans to deploy Pershing-II and cruise missiles.

Now, to the accompaniment of loud groans and "regrets" that the USSR has broken off this unworthy comedy, Pershing-II and cruise missile components are being hastily delivered to West Europe -- to the FRG, Britain, and Italy. NATO's so-called "two-track decision," which envisaged talks first and then "arms upgrading," has become a one-track decision. As Yu.V. Andropov noted in his statement, the appearance of Pershing and cruise missiles on the European Continent "is a fait accompli."

The American mass media, without examining the crux of the matter, hastened to declare that "Reagan has won the battle for missiles." What "battle" is this? The USSR has never fought for an increase in the numbers of missiles. But the U.S. policy aimed at achieving superiority has suffered defeat.

First of all, the strategy of nuclear blackmail that forms the basis of the NATO "two-track decision" has failed. The USSR, under the threat of deployment of new U.S. missiles, did not begin unilateral disarmament.

In his statement, Yu.V. Andropov announced the Soviet Union's lifting of its previously adopted unilateral moratorium on deploying medium-range missiles in the USSR's European part, and also accelerated preparations for the deployment of enhanced-range operational-tactical missiles on the territories of the GDR and the CSSR, by agreement with those countries' governments.

The Pershing-II and cruise missiles, which are capable of reaching the Soviet Union's territory in a few minutes, are in fact not "Eurostrategic" but strategic, in other words, a substantial addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear missile potential on the American Continent and also on the many nuclear submarines that sail the international seas and oceans. The Soviet leadership's decision to deploy corresponding Soviet means in the oceans and seas, including in direct proximity to the United States, nullifies this imaginary advantage too.

As a result, the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles will provide no military-strategic advantages for the United States and NATO.

Ultimately, not only the American concept of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and NATO superiority over the Warsaw Pact but also the whole of U.S. policy on the European Continent will collapse. The deployment of the new missiles is not rallying NATO, as the supporters of "arms upgrading" wish to make out, but on the contrary is causing great rifts within it. And nothing at all remains of the so-called "security-policy" that both the ruling and opposition parties in the FRG were jointly pursuing. The Social Democratic Party of Germany -- the FRG's largest opposition party -- has gone over to antimissile positions. The "Greens" Party resolutely condemns the deployment of U.S. missiles on FRG territory. A deep gulf between the government and the people has also appeared in Britain and Italy on the question of deploying U.S. missiles. "Whereas the Governments of West Germany, Britain, and Italy support Washington," THE NEW YORK TIMES states, "their peoples -- as opinion polls show -- do not support it, and by a considerable majority of votes."

In other words, Reagan's nuclear blackmail against the USSR has failed. Those who succumbed to this blackmail are already reaping the bitter fruits of Reagan's "Pyrrhic victory." Today, the real "focus of evil" for the peoples of West Europe is the United States and its missiles.

Nor is the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe bringing Reagan any political dividends within the United States itself. Some officials in the U.S. Administration, the press reports, who did not expect the measures enumerated by Yu.V. Andropov to be "so tough" are already concerned that the breakdown of the Geneva talks may be a "political blow" to the United States. According to these officials, the absence of talks and the further deployment of missiles will only increase the danger and instability in the international arena. "At the present moment," R. Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, said, "we do not know what to expect."

And it is for this reason that U.S. diplomacy -- if of course we can call it diplomacy -- in an attempt to calm public opinion inside and outside the United States, is now talking about a "rapid resumption of the talks." THE WALL STREET JOURNAL insistently recommends that the administration continue to wage a campaign for a resumption of the talks; otherwise, it warns, the "West European allies may stop supporting the deployment of missiles." Of course, the recommendations are still essentially the same as before: "Pressure" the Soviet Union to force it to make concessions.

Yu.V. Andropov's statement in connection with the start of the deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe, dots all the i's, including on the question of future talks. If the United States and the other NATO countries show a readiness to return to the situation which existed in Europe before the start of the deployment of the new U.S. medium-range missiles, the Soviet Union will also be ready to do so. Then its previously submitted proposals on the question of limiting and reducing nuclear armaments in Europe would again come into force. In that case the USSR's unilateral commitments in this sphere, including the moratorium on missile deployment, would also enter into force again.

The Soviet Union still favors the most radical resolution of the question of nuclear armaments in Europe. Our proposal, namely to make Europe completely free from nuclear weapons, both tactical and medium-range, still remains in force.

The situation is abundantly clear: As long as new U.S. missiles are being deployed in Europe, no talks on medium-range weapons are possible. The talks can only be resumed when the Americans remove their missiles from Europe.

CHERVOV CONTRASTS SS-20'S, 'STRATEGIC' PERSHING'S

AUG71256 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 6 Dec 83 p 6

[Interview given by USSR "military-political expert" Colonel General Nikolay Chervov to APN military commentator V. Morozov: "The United States Has Thwarted the Negotiations on the Most Urgent Problem of European Security; the Responsibility of the United States and Its Allies"]

[Text] [Morozov] Washington has thwarted the talks on the most urgent problem of European security. The U.S. Administration is now trying to claim that it was making concessions at the negotiations, but that the USSR, allegedly, did not appreciate them. Is this true?

[Chervov] The American side was not and is not making any concessions at the Geneva negotiations. For the entire time, the United States was proposing an agreement on the deployment of American missiles in Europe and who knows where else -- is that a concession? The United States refuses to include the British and French weapons -- is that a concession? The American side demands the limiting of our means in the East -- is that supposed to be a concession? The United States agrees with the inclusion of air forces in the agreement, but with the type of inclusion such that only the USSR would reduce. So where are the concessions? There are none, none at all.

The entire U.S. stance at the negotiations revolved around one issue only -- how many missiles and in what structure the United States is to deploy in Europe. Under the pretext of achieving formally "equal" levels in the missiles sphere, Washington wanted to achieve a pronounced inequality to the advantage of the United States and NATO -- a quantitative and qualitative, regional and global inequality.

The American proposals in no way enabled a truly bilateral and profound reduction of the already existing nuclear intermediate-range means in Europe. They put no barrier in the path of the arms race -- of the development of new, ever more dangerous means. Therefore, they cannot be the foundation for working out a bilaterally acceptable agreement that corresponds to the principle of equality and equal security.

The U.S. Administration knows this very well. For 2 whole years it purposefully aimed at thwarting the negotiations. The United States, wishing to deploy its missiles in Europe at any price, did not want to seriously negotiate and agree on a reduction of nuclear intermediate-range weapons. Neither the "zero option" nor the "intermediate variant" of President Reagan were oriented toward achieving bilaterally acceptable agreements, but toward implementing the NATO bloc's "military augmentation" plans.

Today, the United States and its NATO allies are trying to shift the blame for the negotiations' impasse onto the Soviet Union. But the truth always comes to light. It emerged that during the preparations of the NATO "two-track decision," representatives of the United States, the FRG, Great Britain, and France, already in January 1979 (the meeting in Guadeloupe) agreed that on the NATO side the British and French nuclear weapons would be excluded from the balance of forces in the upcoming negotiations on intermediate-range devices. Later, NATO representatives more than once declared that the British and French nuclear weapons have place on the agenda of the negotiations in Geneva. That means that already before the start of the negotiations, the U.S. stance contained a program of a "double game": On the one hand, to evoke the impression of "flexibility" and "seriousness," and on the other to steer the negotiations into blind alleys, until they were finally thwarted.

According to this scenario, the United States played its role in Geneva from the first to the last day. Moreover, it even "outmaneuvered" itself. During the negotiations, when not all possibilities to achieve an agreement had yet been exhausted, the United States -- already in the first days of November -- brought its cruise missiles to Great Britain. Washington actually made the continuation of the negotiations impossible already at the beginning of November. Today, the U.S. Administration, with the assent of the Governments of the FRG, Great Britain, and Italy, has begun deploying American Pershing II's and cruise missiles on the territories of these countries. The factual deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles on the West European territory constitutes the thwarting of the Geneva negotiations, and the Reagan administration is to blame for this.

[Morozov] There is much talk going on in Washington and in Bonn about the United States being allegedly willing to seriously continue the negotiations. It is talking about the "restoration" of the balance of forces in Europe, about the USSR's geographical advantages, and it is comparing the Pershing II missiles with the Soviet SS-20 missiles. What can be said about this?

All these fabrications have only one objective: They strive to divert attention from the commenced deployment of American missiles in Europe, and substantiate the U.S. activity, which led to the aborting of the negotiations.

The declaration of the American side that it is willing to continue the negotiations is of very little value, particularly after the United States knowingly held the negotiations in impasse for 2 years and led them to moribundity, setting its course on deploying new American missiles in Europe.

Washington and Bonn also clearly miscalculated as regards the "geographical factor." The recently published white paper of the FRG Government literally speaks about "global geographical advantages of the West compared with the Soviet Union." Because American representatives like to refer to geography, one recommends that they read the FRG white paper. As regards the comparison of the Pershing II missiles with the SS-20 missiles -- these missiles cannot be compared. The strategic tasks that the Pershing II's are to fulfill can in no way be compared with the tasks of the Soviet SS-20 missiles. This is quite clear to anyone who has only a minimum knowledge of military matters.

The United States is doing all it can to deploy its Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe. What is involved here is neither the "restoration" of balance, nor our SS-20 missiles. No, what is involved here is creating an illusory possibility for winning a nuclear war in Europe. It is precisely for this reason that the United States continues to increase its European nuclear potential.

Representatives of the U.S. Administration are talking a lot about the balance of forces in Europe. However, the fact is that they do not wish such a balance, and that they are not giving thought to it. The United States rejected all Soviet proposals at the negotiations on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe for one reason only: They would constitute for the United States the abandonment of deployment of new American missiles in Europe. Washington will never succeed in covering up this fact with the emptiness of its "zero option."

From the very beginning, the United States was not interested in an agreement, in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in Europe. It also did not care about the negotiations' success. It was attending them only to mask its military preparations.

The decision to deploy American first-strike missiles in Europe -- be it to politically blackmail the USSR, or for the United States to win a nuclear war -- is a silly and shortsighted decision. Washington must comprehend one simple fact: In the issue of nuclear security, we are all in the same boat. And when the United States takes it into its head to sink it, it too will drown.

The Soviet Union has sufficient goodwill to pursue step by step the strengthening of security. But it also has everything necessary to stand up to any military threat.

The White House must abandon its vain hopes that it will succeed in deceiving the Soviet side. Nothing doing there. Realistic politicians must, above all, proceed from the great responsibility which they have for the fate of the peace of the USSR and United States. For this reason Washington must accept the Soviet proposals for reducing nuclear weapons, it must abandon the deployment of its missiles, and take out of Europe those which it has already brought there. And if all this does not happen, it means that the current American Administration is not worthy of this responsibility, that it does not understand it, or does not want to take it upon itself.

[Morozov] Why do the American intermediate-range missiles that are being deployed in West countries constitute an increased nuclear threat to the countries of the European Continent?

[Chervov] The American missiles do not bring Europe security, but the threat of war. First, the nuclear counterweight in Europe will increase, and thus also the danger of war. Second, the Pershings and cruise missiles are first-strike weapons; they are weapons of nuclear blackmail.

Who will push the missiles' button? Under what circumstances can this happen? And what, actually, is the purpose of the Americans' deployment of new missiles in Europe? It is enough to ask ourselves these questions, and we will discover the substance of what has been going on: Permitting missiles to be deployed in their countries, representatives of Bonn, London, and Rome are in fact delivering their fates into the hands of the Pentagon.

[Morozov] The United States, by thwarting the negotiations and by beginning the deployment of its missiles in Europe, has placed the stability of the strategic situation in jeopardy. What is the cause for such dangerous actions from Washington's side?

[Chervov] The main cause is the course to which the U.S. Administration adheres, focused on achieving military superiority in the arms buildup, on achieving superiority in all parts and regions of the world, and in the end, world rule. This course has no chance at all of succeeding. It is historically doomed to fail. But because measures are being taken to implement this course, this can cause irreparable damage and could cost mankind dearly.

Who is responsible for this U.S. course? The American side alone? No, also the allies of the United States carry the full responsibility who, face-to-face with danger and clearly mistaken in their presumptions, are supporting the growth of this danger.

USSR'S 'RESOLUTE' INF COUNTERMOVES EXTOLLED

PMO71407 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 49, 2 Dec 83 pp 6-8

[Article by Vl. Kuznetsov: "Brake for a Policy Without Brakes"]

[Text] Yu. V. Andropov's 24 November statement summed up the 2-year period in Europe's present life during which there was a possibility of resolving during negotiations the question of nuclear arms limitation on the continent.

A question which was a stumbling block on Europe's future path and in relations between the states of East and West in general. The appearance of the first consignments of U.S. nuclear systems in Britain, the FRG, and Italy removed hopes of a favorable outcome to the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on medium-range missiles.

Did the Soviet Union know where Washington was driving matters in aiming from the outset at deploying a first-strike potential, come what may, on the USSR's very threshold and not at attaining a mutually acceptable accord? Of course it did. The real intentions of the champions of "arms upgrading" and their strategy and tactics at the talks were no great secret. But the interests of the security of the USSR and its allies and of the European peoples, the interests of world peace and international security, required that even a minimal chance be used, that every available opportunity be exhausted to try to prevent the aggravation of nuclear confrontation on the continent. And the Soviet Union did make this attempt, realizing the gravity of the problem and conscious of the full measure of its responsibility for the destiny of peace in Europe and beyond.

The Soviet Union has a clear conscience to show the peoples. In Geneva it displayed the maximum patience and readiness for an honest, fair agreement, a sensible compromise that would satisfy the Soviet Union and its allies and the United States and its NATO partners and that would enable Europe to continue the path of peace and security along which it has been marching for 38 years, without the risk of being drawn into a nuclear conflict.

However, in the warped brains of the hardliners, the USSR's goodwill was refracted as "a manifestation of weakness." In the grips of a fanatical desire for military superiority, they have started to talk about how it is only with the appearance of the U.S. nuclear missiles that "serious talks" will begin, meaning by that their partners' capitulation and his enforced agreement to Reagan's "zero option," that is the USSR's unilateral disarmament. They have almost persuaded their colleagues that that is exactly what will happen, that they only have to encircle the table in Geneva with missiles.

The resolute retaliatory steps taken by the Soviet leadership had the effect of a cold shower on the Pentagon and NATO hotheads. Having failed to appreciate the maximum goodwill and flexibility, they received the maximum firmness. Those who ventured to turn the Geneva talks into a procedure for extorting concessions, under the threat of Pershings and cruise missiles, into a screen for their militarist preparations in Europe, can, of course, remain on the shores of Lake Geneva (on instructions from the U.S. President, part of the delegation is being retained there) as long as they see fit. Talks whose subject is THE LIMITATION of nuclear arms in Europe cannot be talks on THE BUILDUP of U.S. medium-range nuclear weapons [above passages in uppercase published in boldface]. Those who tried to present these weapons as some kind of stimulus to "serious negotiations" have proved to be braggarts.

The self-sufficient, unbridled politicians have received yet another object lesson. The imperialist instruments -- threats, blackmail, strong-arm methods, ultimatums -- still work in some places in the world, but not in that part of the world where people live by the laws of socialist society and where they can give a fitting rebuff to the "world gendarme's" hegemonistic ways.

In the estimation of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Yu.V. Andropov's statement "concentrates the will of the entire party and entire Soviet people and their steady resolve to give a due reply to the adventurist, militarist policy of the present U.S. Administration and the NATO bloc and to reliably protect the security of our country and the socialist community as a whole."

The measures announced by the Soviet leadership with respect to the United States and its NATO allies are a brake on the path of a policy without brakes. The Pentagon-NATO first-strike bridgehead that is being created is being countered by a reliable defensive rampart, and that aggressive bridgehead will be neutralized. The survival chances of the adventurists who are considering a first strike will not increase with the Pershings and cruise missiles. What will happen if these people dare to press the button, they can graphically see from the movie "The Day After," which has recently shaken America by its harsh, naked truth, by the apocalyptic epilogue to a nuclear conflict unleashed in Europe.

And so the steps that have been taken are clipping the "hawks'" nuclear talons. And we can understand the "disappointment" of the initiators of "arms upgrading," who have been thrown into confusion and compelled to draw conclusions that are hardly comforting.

What have they actually succeeded in doing and what have they failed to do? They have succeeded in setting about concentrating in Western Europe, in the vicinity of a "potential enemy," nuclear might that increases the nuclear threat to the USSR and its allies. But the use of this might is linked with a suicidal risk to the United States and NATO. They have succeeded in insinuating their new missiles onto the continent contrary to Europe's will, but Europe has not and never will come to terms with it. They have succeeded in getting their own way in NATO, in acquiring a new lever for exerting hegemonistic influence on their allies, but the seats of resistance to Washington's plans have not been suppressed even in the bloc itself, and the Governments of the FRG, Britain, Italy, and other NATO states are having to rule without a popular vote of confidence on a key issue of their security policy. Highly dubious, illusory military-strategic pluses and highly tangible political minuses and moral and political loss in the eyes of European and world public opinion -- that is the balance.

The Soviet Union does not regard the present situation in Europe as hopelessly bad or irreversible. The palisade of U.S. missiles will not obscure the prospect of a nuclear-free Europe. The diplomatic and public struggle for this goal is continuing and is burning with new force. The peoples of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and the antinuclear movement will grasp still more firmly the banner of the struggle for a peaceful and secure Europe marching along the trail blazed by the all-European conference.

It is just such a Europe, and not a supernuclear one, which would best accord with long-term national interests and the safeguarding of the security of those countries whose leaders are now trying to push the continent from the Helsinki route into the channel of instability and unpredictability and the aggravation of military and nuclear antagonism and political complications. Convinced of this, the Soviet Union has appealed, as Yu.V. Andropov's statement has done, to the leaders of the United States and the other NATO countries to weigh up once more all the consequences with which their own peoples and all mankind are threatened by the implementation of the plans to deploy the new U.S. missiles in Europe. If the United States and the other NATO countries change their minds and consider that it is for the best to abandon their shortsighted stance and risky and dangerous "arms upgrading" venture, then the Soviet Union would welcome it. An opportunity would then appear for restoring the situation existing prior to the start of the deployment of the U.S. medium-range system in Europe. If the West talks not demagogically, not hypocritically, but seriously of the possibility of dismantling the missiles which are now being installed, then it would be worthwhile giving thorough, unbiased consideration to the proposal from Moscow.

The Soviet people and the European people may be sure that the Soviet Union will do everything in its power to minimize the damage caused to the all-European peace process by the deployment of the new U.S. nuclear weapons. That is precisely how the entire progressive world has interpreted Yu.V. Andropov's statement. It has interpreted it as a voice of reason, of high responsibility for the destiny of peace, of confidence in its ultimate triumph.

And this voice has overwhelmed the propagandist chorus of Atlanticists, that is hypocritically lamenting the USSR's refusal to continue talks with those who have emasculated them and deprived them of any meaning.

The first U.S. nuclear missiles are arriving in Europe, but no cries of triumph are to be heard even from the lips of the most zealous champions of NATO's nuclear missile "arms upgrading." There is no denying that they are in an unenviable position.

They are having to transport the missiles secretly, hiding from the eyes of the public, almost as though the missiles were contraband.

They are having to resort to mass arrests of opponents of the introduction of missiles into Western Europe and to fight their own population.

They have had to seek in the parliaments where they have a majority, at present at least, a semblance of the approval that their peoples are denying them.

They are having to justify something for which there is neither justification nor the slightest intelligible explanation. They are still spending a great amount of time on the story of "serious talks" after the deployment of the new missiles and claiming that they "will compel the return" of the USSR to Geneva. The gentlemen now coming out with these utterly frivolous assertions have forgotten what they were saying themselves only yesterday. Let us remind these forgetful people of the warning issued by, for instance, FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher: "...Every medium-range missile deployed complicates negotiations." They are now trying to assure us that this is not complicating but facilitating these negotiations. First "arms upgrading," then successful talks, and then the fathers of NATO's "two-track decision" with sweat on their brows are to dismantle the missiles which they are now installing in Britain, the FRG, and Italy, and intend to deploy in Belgium and the Netherlands. What an idyll! Why deploy the missiles at all? It turns out that "the main reason for deploying the cruise missiles in Britain is the desire to make the Russians agree on nuclear arms limitation." This pearl comes from Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe.

"A nuclear conflict in Europe or a war using conventional weapons has never been so unlikely as now." That is the opinion of FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner. Nice to hear; all the nicer because M. Woerner himself and many of his NATO colleagues have been vying with one another in their allegations that the Soviets, using their "preponderance" of conventional weapons, are on the point of charging into Western Europe.

The minister is echoed by former Bundeswehr inspector (V. Altenburg) who has "completely ruled out the possibility of nuclear war between East and West." "The Soviet Union does not want a nuclear or, seemingly, a nonuclear war either." Thank you: The USSR indeed does not want any war. But what about the others -- those who by deploying a first-strike potential in the FRG are turning it into a "frontline" state (this term, incidentally, was first used not in the East but the West), into a bridgehead for a "limited" nuclear war?

Indeed, the Europeans need not fear such a "limited" war. They only have to trust and believe British Defense Secretary Michael Heseltine. Who should know better than he that "the British and U.S. deterrent forces, combined with the fact that the Russians are a sensible people, will prevent a limited war in Europe." We will not object to the secretary's assessment of the Russians, but how sensible are the "British and U.S. deterrent forces" that are unleashing an unbridled nuclear arms race in Europe, a race which threatens ultimately to end in conflict?

Here indeed we have a case of: He whom the gods have decided to punish they first make mad.

He who is creating the danger is seeking to belittle its dimensions. Why? To weaken resistance to his dangerous plans. To avoid responsibility for possible grave consequences. Those who are stockpiling combustible material for a third and final world war want the Europeans to forget the grim and tragic lessons of World War I and World War II.

But let us hope that the Europeans' memory does not fail them and that the NATO tranquilizers have no effect on them. It is not enough merely to be aware of the true dimensions of the danger. To ensure that the danger does not develop into something worse, a resolute, uncompromising struggle must be declared against it -- a struggle all the way to the complete disappearance of the nuclear threat created by the United States and NATO.

WESTERN REACTIONS TO INF DEPLOYMENT CITED

LD080030 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] New York December 7 TASS -- In an article in THE NEW YORK TIMES, the well known U.S. scientist Richard Barnett notes the growing resistance in the countries of Western Europe to the adventurist policy of the Reagan administration striving to turn the West European peoples into its nuclear hostages. Over one and a half million people in NATO member-countries, he writes, demonstrated in the streets from the month of October to express their opposition to Washington's policy in the field of nuclear arms. Washington's plans to use nuclear weapons on the continent have caused a feeling of profound alarm, rather than a sense of security in Europe. They threaten to destroy what they are allegedly called upon to defend.

Vienna December 7 TASS -- In embarking on deployment of their new missiles in Europe, the Pentagon and NATO strategists could not but be aware of the fact that this would bring measures of response from the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty member-states, stresses the resolution adopted by a meeting of former Austrian International Brigades fighters -- participants in the Spanish Civil War. What is at issue is first-strike weapons, and the champions of a "crusade" against communism did not wish to forego their deployment in Europe despite the fact that the USSR Government repeatedly warned them against taking such a step.

Rome December 7 TASS -- Yuriy Andropov's statement produces a strong impression, stressed, according to reports reaching here, the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel M. Vilner. The measures adopted by the USSR in response to deployment of U.S. missiles in Europe are not only justified, but also indispensable for saving peace in the world and for preventing a nuclear catastrophe. The policy of the USA and its NATO allies is a tragedy for mankind. Happily for all people, there exists the Soviet Union which defends peace on earth and possesses sufficient military and economic might not to allow U.S. imperialism to gain a military superiority that would encourage it to pursue an objective which Hitler failed to attain -- that of establishing world domination.

As regards the Government of Israel, M. Vilner went on to say, it not only supports Washington's policy threatening the whole world, but is also expanding strategic cooperation with it. Israel is becoming a military base of the USA for actions against the independent countries of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf area, and its army is becoming an army of U.S. mercenaries, gun fodder used by Washington to achieve the aims of its global policy.

WARSAW PACT DEFENSE MINISTERS SESSION ENDS

PM071815 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "On the Outcome of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee Session"]

[Text] A routine session of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee was held in Sofia 5-7 December under the chairmanship of Army General Dobri Dzhurov, minister of national defense of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The defense ministers of the Warsaw Pact states, the commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces, and the chief of staff of the Joint Armed Forces took part in the session's work.

The Defense Ministers' Committee examined questions of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces' practical activity, taking account of the situation which has taken shape in Europe and in the spirit of the 5 January 1983 Prague Political Declaration and the 28 June 1983 joint statement by the seven socialist states' leading party and state figures, and took appropriate decisions.

The session proceeded in a businesslike way and in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

HISTORY OF WARSAW PACT DEFENSE ALLIANCE REVIEWED

AU071636 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 6 Dec 83 p 3

[Article by USSR Major General Professor Stepan Tyushkevich, doctor of philosophy, written especially for NARODNA ARMIYA and dispatched through APN: "Decisive Factor of Defense Power"]

[Text] The defense of socialist achievements is a necessary and law-governed function of the socialist state. This should be stressed with particular emphasis today, when international imperialism -- U.S. reactionary circles as well as the Reagan administration, above all -- are drastically intensifying their attacks against socialism, when the danger of a conflagration of war, including nuclear war, has greatly increased.

In realistically evaluating the present international situation, which implies the danger of a disaster affecting all mankind, the Soviet state, together with the other socialist community member-countries and with all peace-loving forces, is waging a persistent struggle for international security and is implementing a firm policy aimed at the preservation of peace. In these activities the Soviet Union is guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory confirmed by historical experience, about the necessity of maintaining constant vigilance and about the readiness to resist any aggression.

This is why, since the United States began the deployment of Pershing II ballistic missiles and of land-based, long-distance cruise missiles in a number of West European countries that are NATO members, the Soviet Union, in accordance with the agreement between the USSR, the GDR, and the CSSR, began preparatory work for the deployment of missile complexes for operational-tactical purposes.

In defending the achievements of socialism, national and international interests of the proletariat are merging and the unity of their goals in the struggle against capitalism is manifesting itself. This has been confirmed as early as in the 1918-20 period when the young, multinational Soviet Republic was forced to wage civil war and to resist the pressure of foreign military intervention.

The peoples who had seized power with their own hands formed a close military and economic alliance that played an important role in the victory over counterrevolution from the inside and from abroad. Vladimir Ilich Lenin stressed as follows in this context: "...a unity of military forces is necessary and withdrawal from this unity is inadmissible." This Leninist conclusion was fully confirmed by the subsequent experience in armed conflicts forced upon the Soviet people and other peoples who are proceeding along the path of socialist construction.

The USSR Armed Forces played a decisive role in the victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism. They successfully protected the freedom and independence of their own motherland and accomplished a glorious liberation mission in the countries of Europe and Asia occupied by the aggressor. Liberation armies created by the patriotic forces in a number of countries participated in this struggle together with the Soviet Union. I will recall the fact that the first units and groups of units of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania were established on the territory of the USSR. The Mongolian People's Republic was a reliable friend and ally in the war years. Its Armed Forces, together with Soviet troops, actively participated in the defeat of the Japanese militarists. Thus, the fraternity in arms, born in the first years of Soviet Government, assumed new significance in the years of World War II.

Following the end of World War II necessary measures for the further consolidation of military-political cooperation between the USSR and the fraternal states on a bilateral basis were adopted. In addition to the friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance treaties signed by the Soviet Union with Czechoslovakia and Poland during the war, similar treaties were signed in 1948 with Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. At the same time the majority of European countries with people's democratic governments signed friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance treaties with each other. This signified that a new system of relations based on alliance treaties involving the USSR and the countries proceeding along the path of socialist construction had been established in Europe. The collective defense of achievements relied upon the solid international basis of military-political cooperation among the fraternal states, which contributed to a consolidation of peace in Europe. The militant cooperation of these countries' armies was raised to a new level.

The establishment of the Warsaw Pact Organization in 1955 represented the next step in the collective defense of socialism. The creation of a defense alliance of socialist states was a necessity and a timely measure in facing the aggressive attempts of the imperialist states. It objectively contributed to the people's security and to the consolidation of peace on our planet.

The defense power of the socialist community countries is based upon the socio-political uniformity of the social and state systems in those countries, upon the uniform ideology of Marxism-Leninism, upon the common final goal -- the construction of communism -- which unites them. The leading role of the communist and workers parties is the main factor in this respect. The increasing capability of socialist society to increase its successes in the economic, social, political, and intellectual sphere, as well as in the defense of its revolutionary achievements, exerts a favorable and beneficial influence upon the entire atmosphere throughout the world.

Thanks to collective efforts, the sinister intentions of international reaction have been brought to failure on several occasions. This happened in 1957, when the Soviet Union rendered fraternal assistance to the Hungarian people in liquidating the counterrevolutionary mutiny; in 1961, when the Warsaw Pact member-countries supported the GDR's defense measures along the borders with West Berlin; it happened in 1968, when with joint actions the USSR, Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, and Poland rendered assistance to the people of Czechoslovakia in protecting its socialist achievements.

The Warsaw Pact members resolutely supported the Cuban revolution and assisted heroic Vietnam in its struggle against U.S. imperialism.

The collective defense measures of the Warsaw Pact member-countries are aimed at the prevention of a new world war, at the insurance of peace. Yu.V. Andropov stressed as follows: "The Soviet Union will do everything within its power in order to insure a peaceful and calm future for the present-day and future generations."

The entire history of the socialist countries' development confirms that the peace-loving character of their foreign policy is organically coordinated with their readiness to resist aggressors. Only the imperialist threat is forcing the socialist community to devote unrelenting care to keeping up the combat readiness and fighting capacity of their armed forces at a level necessary to resist any aggression. The Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact Organization and the fraternal armies have everything necessary to fulfill the tasks they have been assigned. "It is high time for whoever is concerned to become aware of the fact that we will succeed under any circumstances in guaranteeing our country's security and the security of our friends and allies," the declaration issued by Yuriy Andropov, CPSU Central Committee secretary general and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, points out.

"The Soviet people can be confident about the high standards of our country's defense power, so that we do not advise anyone to test his strength," the declaration further states. Now, that imperialism is intensifying international tension and is trying to disrupt the approximate balance of military forces, to attain military superiority over the socialist countries, the consolidation of cohesion, collectivity, and mutual assistance in the framework of the socialist community is assuming particular importance. To defend peace means to defend the most important thing — the right of living. This historical task can be accomplished solely with the joint efforts of the peace-loving forces on our planet, the socialist countries in the first place. They have been a solid support of peace on earth and they will continue to be such a support.

CEMA CHEMICAL INDUSTRY PANEL MEETS IN HUNGARY

PMO61133 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the rubric "Eloquent Indicators"]

[Text] Budapest, 2 Dec — A regular session of the CEMA Permanent Commission for the Chemical Industry has been held in Balatonoszod. Taking part were delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, Cuba, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia and also a delegation from Yugoslavia. Representatives of a number of international organizations attended the session.

The commission discussed tasks in the sphere of the chemical, pulp and paper, and microbiological industries stemming from the decisions adopted at the 37th sitting of the CEMA session, and examined questions of coordinating the development plans for these sectors for 1986-1990.

The session participants discussed the progress in fulfilling the tasks of rationally exploiting fuel, energy, and raw material resources and implementing agreements on cooperation in the sphere of the chemical industry. The commission examined other questions of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation.

NATO DEFENSE MINISTERS MEETING 'SETBACK' FOR U.S.

LD072134 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 7 Dec 83

["A Setback For the Pentagon" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasilii Kharkov writes:

Tuesday became a "black day" for the Pentagon chief at the NATO Brussels headquarters where defence ministers of the North Atlantic Bloc countries are ending their series of meetings today. Submitted by Weinberger, the list of thirty new arms systems that the USA would like to foist on its NATO allies, was rejected by its West European partners. The British newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES describes this development as a serious setback for the United States.

Prior to the meeting of the NATO Military Planning Committee, Washington was quite busy trying to influence its NATO partners to go along with it. In working to get the meeting's approval for the new vast military programme, the USA hoped to put on the West European countries a new burden of arms race, fraught with extremely serious military-political as well as economic consequences.

Upon arrival in the Belgian capital, Weinberger said that now that deployment of the Euromissiles has got under way, the time has come to determine what is to be done for a further modernisation of armaments.

It did not prove difficult for the West European partners of the USA to see that Washington's desire to begin the production of 30 new types of weapons for NATO would mean for them a not only dangerous but economically onerous new round of arms race. In addition to the three per cent annual increase in the NATO countries' military budgets, also imposed by Washington, the programme would require fresh billions in appropriations.

Moreover, Washington's desire to equip NATO with 30 new systems of arms developed in the United States would make the West European countries even more dependent on America.

At present, when deployment of U.S. Pershings and cruise missiles has already got under way in some of the West European countries, one cannot fail to see that these countries are entrusting their security into the hands of Reagan administration which is volatile, unpredictable and has a knack for adventures. In these conditions, most of the NATO members at the meeting in Brussels proved reluctant to take another risky step connected with the Pentagon's new military programme.

And the fact that Washington once again exerted pressure on U.S. partners in NATO, nudging them to further increase their arms arsenals, provides fresh confirmation of its rabid militarist course, its desire to achieve a U.S. military superiority so as to dictate American conditions to other countries, including the NATO allies.

DISUNITY PERCEIVED AMONG NATO NATIONS ON MISSILES

LD071139 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] At NATO's winter session in Brussels, the United States demanded that its allies increase their annual spending on military objectives by 3 percent. However, not all the calls by Weinberger, head of the U.S. Defense Department, are meeting with a response.

Many of Washington's partners are refusing to take upon themselves an additional burden of military spending. Neither is there unity on the main question of the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Denmark and Greece have officially disassociated themselves from the deployment of these weapons in Western Europe. The Netherlands and Belgium are constantly putting off making a final decision on the issue.

WFTU CONDEMNS U.S. 'MASS BOMBING' IN LEBANON

LD080005 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Prague December 7 TASS -- The World Federation of Trade Unions condemned resolutely the mass bombing by U.S. warplanes of the positions of the Lebanese national patriotic forces and Syrian forces included in the inter-Arab peace-keeping forces in Lebanon.

The U.S. aggressive action, says the statement of the WFTU circulated here today, confirms that Washington and Tel Aviv declared against peace in the Middle East.

The World Federation of Trade Unions urges workers and trade union organisations of all countries to intensify effective solidarity with the Lebanese and Syrian peoples. It demands an immediate end to the United States' and Israel's aggression against Lebanon and withdrawal of their forces from Lebanon.

The aggressive actions of Washington and Tel Aviv against Lebanon and Syria represent a serious threat to peace in the Middle East and to universal peace, says the WFTU statement.

REAGAN'S CSCE REPORT DENOUNCED AS 'PURE LIES'

LD080014 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1440 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Washington, 7 Dec (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports:

A cynical exercise in hypocrisy -- this is the only way to describe the White House's latest slanderous "opus" which was distributed here on Tuesday -- the U.S. President's semi-annual report on the fulfillment of the provisions of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe Final Act.

This is the 15th such "document" on this subject by Washington, which has voluntarily taken upon itself the role of some kind of "judge" who has been called upon to monitor other countries' observance of the Helsinki agreements. However, as in previous "works", there is no hint in the document of any objectivity or even of any decency. Thus the report admits in passing the importance of the Madrid meeting of representatives of the member states of the European conference which ended in September of this year. The final document of the Madrid meeting, the authors point out, demands from the states "responsible behavior in international affairs."

This is being said at the height of the feverish militarist activity by the United States to deploy on the European Continent the latest generation of U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons, "Pershing II" and cruise missiles! Can one really describe as "responsible behavior" the criminal schemes of the United States to disrupt the strategic balance that has come about in Europe and in the world as a whole, to resort to nuclear blackmail against the socialist community, and its clear intention to place under a lethal threat the already fragile peace on the European Continent?

Does the United States not belong to those states that signed the final document of the Madrid meeting, states that pledged themselves to "devote genuine efforts toward restraining the increasing growth of weapons, and also toward strengthening trust, security and assisting disarmament?" Is it free from observance of these provisions?

Each page of the presidential "document" contains pure lies. The USSR and the other socialist countries are accused of literally every mortal sin. They are accused, for example, of violating the nations rights to self-determination and free political, social and cultural development. It is as if the USSR, not the United States, recently carried out the piratic intervention against sovereign Grenada, trampling on the right of this people to a development free from American diktat. No lie can hide the fact that it is the United States that is now preparing intervention against revolutionary Nicaragua, carrying out unprecedented brigandage in Lebanon, trying to destroy the sovereignty and independence of that country, and striving to destroy the whole of the Palestinian people.

The President's report is as usual bristling with lies about alleged human rights "violations" in socialist countries. The White House has the gall to go into paroxysms of hysteria about mythical "religious repression" in the USSR. The commission appointed by the President himself on human rights in the United States meanwhile was recently forced to admit that "discrimination on the basis of religion in the United States" is very existent and extremely widespread, rather than mythical.

There is one striking peculiarity about all the Presidential reports without exception on the observance of the Helsinki agreements. Of all the 35 member states of the general European conference, the self-appointed Washington "judges" chose for their "analysis" only socialist countries, and modestly "kept quiet" about the crude violations of civil rights and freedom in the West. This is understandable. The Western countries, above all the United States, have nothing to say in justification of their profoundly antipopular militaristic policies. The report itself is merely the latest useless attempt to deflect international attention away from these policies, and the latest pretext for slandering the socialist world.

'FOLLY' OF REAGAN'S POLITICAL VIEWS SATIRIZED

PM071040 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Dec 83 p 2

[Aleksandr Bovin "Pamphlet": "In Praise of Reagan"]

[Text] No White House incumbent has garnered such a bounteous harvest of criticism as Ronald Reagan, the 40th President of the United States. He is railed against by his own people, foreigners, right-wingers, and left-wingers. Some limit themselves to sophisticated gibes, others forget about sophistication. Some recall how the President fell asleep at his audience with the Pope. Others smirk at how he confused Uruguay with Paraguay. Others draw parallels between Reagan's convoy roles and his present role. And so forth.

I will cite one example from thousands -- a profile published in the Delhi STATESMAN. "Ronald Reagan," it alleges, "is a virtual ignoramus about most questions except politicking -- an area where he shows exceptional guile. He is so bereft of modesty that it verges on presumption; he is impulsive, lazy, stubborn, emotional... And the main point is," the paper continues, "he is truly paranoid when it comes to the Russians. He thinks that the root of all evil in the world is the Russians, that they are hiding under every bed, are striving to implant communism through out the globe, and will do so unless they are stopped by armed force."

That is the kind of thing they are writing about Ronald Reagan. Unfavorable. But is it fair? After all, what seems unfavorable from one angle may not seem so unfavorable from another.

Let us turn to the classical legacy. Almost 500 years ago Erasmus of Rotterdam did something that not everyone would have dared to -- he wrote "In Praise of Folly" (Footnote) (Academia. Moscow-Leningrad 1931). Let us act equally decisively too: Let us allow the famous humanist of the late Middle Ages to peek into our own time and ask him to comment on the above quotation from the Indian paper.

Roughly translated from Latin to Russian the commentary might sound something like this.

...Only incorrigible snobs can reproach the President on grounds of ignorance. For nobody has ever shown that ignorance is bad for a politician. Rather, the converse is true. Knowledge is bad. All knowledge is limiting. It limits and shackles freedom of choice. It makes you hesitate and analyze and evaluate various options for action. By indicating the limits of the possible it binds initiative and sows doubt in one's own strength.

No, the Americans did right to elect someone free from any intellectual chains as President. It should have been done earlier. And then American would even now have been waging a victorious war in Vietnam. And perhaps in Angola or Mozambique too. And then the U.S. Marines would not have allowed the Panamanians to take the Panama Canal from America -- a canal that, despite the misnomer, is utterly American. And then there would have been no SALT I and SALT II, which undermined America's security.

In short, if Reagan had been elected President some 10 years ago America would now be a far more respected power. True, the President would have to telephone his condolences to the bereaved families far more often. I am afraid that the presidential workday might not suffice. But there is a way out -- standard condolences could be taped...

I also cannot agree with the reproaches of idleness and stubbornness. What is so bad about that? Just imagine how many islands, territories, and states there are in the world -- besides Grenada -- that, in the President's opinion, are in the sphere of U.S. vital interests. Just imagine, in his opinion again, how many peoples cannot wait for the U.S. Rangers to march in (or fly in, or sail in) to restore order! You can imagine that in the heat of liberation they will bomb a couple of hospitals. After all, they do not bomb healthy people.

But if, as is said, the President is too lazy to listen to his advisers' advice, if, as is written, he is too lazy to answer troublesome journalists' questions, if, as is rumored, he is too lazy to seek out on the map yet more targets for yet more liberation missions, then surely this laziness is a saving grace. It is quite natural. An absence of knowledge stimulates presumptuous activity, but the laziness limits this activity a little. It is all to the good. After all, not everyone is afraid of America. They can give as good as they get. Insult the President. Who needs it?

Or take stubbornness. A President has to have stubbornness. Otherwise he will get muddled. Say there is an intention to install new U.S. missiles in West Europe. To teach Moscow a lesson, as it were. But then a babble of voices arises. Some say Moscow is ready to search for a compromise and reduce the number of its missiles. Others assert that the siting of new U.S. missiles in West Europe does not increase but decreases the security of American's West European allies. Others suggest that a new spiral of the arms race in West Europe will heighten international tension still more and conflict with U.S. national interests. Others think up something else. This is where stubbornness is needed, that is, the ability to stick to your guns regardless of the arguments. Otherwise a good idea will be ruined.

And the President has lots of good ideas. Lost positions in Central America must be recovered. Israel must be helped to consolidate its hold on the Arab lands. The liberation of Namibia must be obstructed and the destabilization of the racist South African regime must be prevented at all costs. Much more must be done. But there are always troublemaking smart-alecks who for each "must" advance well argued "must nots" and who will contend that each of the listed and unlisted "musts" shames America and drives its policy into a dangerous militarist blind alley. If the President were not stubborn but yielded to irresponsible intricacies of thought, where would America be now? Might it have signed SALT III [as published]? Or a treaty putting a stop to underground nuclear tests? That is awful.

Finally, paranoia. That is typical slander. I am sure that the President is an absolutely healthy man. His actions are irreproachably logical and imbued with almost Cartesian rationalism.

Indeed. Suppose the President took the naive and essentially un-American point of view that social changes, even those unwelcome to the United States, are caused primarily by profoundly internal factors and reflect the masses' growing dissatisfaction with the existing order of things. The President would then have to explain why virtually every social explosion represents a blow to U.S. influence and prestige. And then the attempts to hold back the course of social change by armed force would look exceedingly strange. And then many Americans would be bound to wonder why America is out of step with the times. So you'd really have to lose your mental health in order to bring such a heap of problems down on yourself and your compatriots.

But the President -- not because of paranoia but because of his innate common sense -- rejects all this demobilizing gobbledygook that corrupts the American soil. A truth that Americans can understand must be as simple as chewing gum. If something not Washington's liking happens anywhere, it means that malicious and evil people are at work stirring things up and staging revolutions just to annoy the good and worthy Americans.

"Havana's hand" is seen in one place, and "Moscow's hand" in another. And a "hand" is immeasurably simpler and more comprehensible than mysterious internal factors. If there is a hand it must be slapped down, and everything will turn out in the best possible way for America. That is how the President thinks, being, so to speak, in full possession of his faculties.

But anyone who tries to prove that the President's handmade philosophy is the fruit of his paranoid mind and no way corresponds to reality may perhaps be well up on psychiatry but knows nothing of politics.

Erasmus of Rotterdam wrote "In Praise of Folly" in 1509. Since then the historical scene has changed appreciably. Other actors are involved in other shows. But "Queen Folly," to whom Erasmus paid homage, still plays her part. And therefore the President must still be repeatedly defended from unscrupulous nitpickers and slanders.

No doubt foreseeing the triumphant day when Reagan receives the Nobel Peace Prize, Erasmus of Rotterdam wrote: "Most people hate war and pray for peace. Only a few, whose base prosperity depends on the people's suffering, desire war. Whether or not it is fair that their lack of honor carries greater weight and force than the will of all good men is for you to judge."

BURT REMARKS ON USSR EURASIAN STRATEGY 'LIES'

PMO71500 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Vladimir Kudryavtsev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Is It Not Better To Look at Yourself..."; article is accompanied by following disclaimer: "From the editors: IZVESTIYA publishes articles devoted to topical questions of international life under the rubrics 'Political Observer's Opinion' and 'Problems and Opinions. Though offering these rubrics for a comprehensive discussion of a given problem, the editorial office cannot fully share the opinion expressed by the author"]

[Text] U.S. propaganda's falsity, which has received the blessing of the head of the U.S. Administration himself, is confirmed literally every day, if not every hour. On this occasion it has served as the basis for an article in THE WASHINGTON POST by Richard Burt, U.S. assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs. Mr Burt's distortion of facts and trends might not be worthy of attention since he did not go beyond the limits of U.S. propaganda's usual distortion of reality. However, my attention was drawn to one paragraph that deserves elucidation.

In his article Burt writes: "Moscow has been trying to isolate Europe from Asia in an attempt to focus the Geneva talks on Europe so as not to hamper the growth of its large Armed Forces directed against Asia." First, in this allegation there is, so to speak, no geographical logic. For the Soviet Union, to isolate Europe from Asia would amount to splitting our country in two, since it is both a European and an Asian power. And naturally the USSR cannot be indifferent to what happens on both continents. Burt may find this position hard to understand at a time when the United States "finds" vital interests at the other end of the world from its own borders.... Second, Europe attracts the attention of a European power -- the Soviet Union -- because it is in Europe that the United States is siting its new missile weapons, and it would be more logical to consider that it is none other than the United States that is trying to isolate the Soviet Union from what is happening in Asia. Third, in saying that while focusing attention on Europe the USSR is allegedly building up its already large Armed Forces in Asia, the author is counting on his readers' ignorance, or, if he is being frank with himself, then he too is prone to this human weakness.

It is not hard to see this for yourself if you take even a cursory look at what the United States is doing in Asia. Let us start with Japan. U.S. President Reagan's recent visit to this country confirmed yet again that the United States is pushing Japan into a further buildup of its Armed Forces aimed against the Soviet Union. The 100-plus U.S. military bases and installations on Japanese territory are directed against the USSR. In the eyes of the U.S. military, Japan is becoming a sort of "illegal" member of NATO, the aggressive military bloc countering the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community. Let us add that there are over 45,000 U.S. officers and men in Japan. South Korea, which Reagan also visited and where the Pentagon also has military bases and roughly the same number of U.S. servicemen are stationed, makes no secret of the fact that the United States is cobbling together an aggressive Washington-Tokyo-Seoul "triangle" aimed against the Soviet Union.

To the south lies the Japanese island of Okinawa, which has been turned into a gigantic U.S. naval and air base. Even further south, in the Philippines, the United States has two large bases -- the air base at Clark Field and the naval base at Subic Bay. In the Indian Ocean there is the large naval and air base on the island of Diego Garcia, around which the large Indian Ocean flotilla is concentrated -- a flotilla not inferior in size and composition to the U.S. Mediterranean 6th and Pacific 7th Fleets. Further on come the naval strong-holds and corresponding flotillas of warships in the Persian Gulf region.

In the Near East the United States is not only supporting the Zionist Israeli leadership in every direction, but is also building up its own military presence both in the Sinai Peninsula zone and especially in Lebanon, where the U.S. Marines are supported by a large armada of warships -- from aircraft carriers to various transport ships. If you add to this the island of Cyprus, where NATO has military bases and in the north of which troops from Turkey -- a U.S. ally -- are stationed, then the picture becomes quite clear and the lies of Furt and his masters "shrive away," as Russian folk tales say in this regard.

Let us take advantage of this opportunity to recall that at the moment when the Burt article appeared in THE WASHINGTON POST Israeli Prime Minister Shamir and his war [Voyenny] Minister Arens were in the United States. What did they and President Reagan, Secretary of State Shultz, and Defense Secretary Weinberger talk about? It seems that the talks laid the basis for a new stage in U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation. Not that the meeting did not discuss ways of resolving the Lebanese crisis provoked by Israel and its guardian -- the United States -- but quite the reverse: How to make Lebanon bring to fruition the agreement with Israel on mutual recognition that was foisted on it, and how to put pressure on Syria, which occupies a consistent anti-Israeli and anti-American position, without parading direct U.S. interference.

One wonders: Why this "caution" on the part of the U.S. aggressors and pretenders to Near East hegemony. The U.S. ruling circles, for all their imperial self-confidence, have to reckon with the truly global indignation aroused by the brazen aggression in Grenada, particularly against the backdrop of the forthcoming presidential elections. The deaths of many U.S. Marines in Lebanon -- at the very moment when Israeli forces withdrew to South Lebanon -- had an equally great influence on the U.S. position during the talks with the Israeli statesmen in Washington. Who knows, there may be a revival of the Vietnam syndrome among the U.S. public!

It was under these conditions that the following formula emerged: "Unleash the Israeli army and support its actions with U.S. naval and air forces without resorting to the use of U.S. ground forces." (Incidentally, as regards the U.S. naval forces off Lebanese shores, agreement has now been reached on their continued presence there.)

This arrangement was manifested in the barbaric U.S. bomber raid on the Lebanese mountain region, where Syrian troops, who are in Lebanon by decision of the Arab League, have their positions. The United States simultaneously promised to give Israel large quantities of aid in armaments, financing, and so forth. In short, the U.S.-Israeli accord is fraught with the danger of a new outbreak of aggressive actions in Lebanon. And for the purpose not only of turning Lebanon into a Zionist puppet, but also of striking against Syria.

The Near East, however, is not walled off from the rest of the world, and therefore what is going on world wide -- the growth of the antiwar movement of many millions of people -- is having an increasing influence on events in the region. That is why THE NEW YORK TIMES comes to conclusion that "U.S. attempts to unravel Lebanese problems with Israeli help are only increasing the risk both to Israel and to the United States itself."

Returning to Burt, we say that though he may hope that some people will far for his anti-Soviet lies just because the Far East and Southeast Asia are a long way from Europe, the Near East is quite another: For it is near enough (to Europe) for the European public to see the U.S. policy pursued in this region as a direct threat to the continent's vital interests. The U.S. Lebanese adventure is dragging into its orbit not only the Near East, but also the east Mediterranean, and that is already, so to speak, Europe.

U.S. 'CONTEMPTUOUS ATTITUDE' TOWARD PRC DECRIED

OW072333 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1100 GMT 4 Dec 83

[(Tulin) article: "The Old Habit"]

[Text] What Chinese diplomatic courier Yang Guoqiang did was most inglorious. Possibly the American way of life was exceptionally attractive to him, or he was tired of his motherland, or -- as the saying goes -- he was possessed by a devil. Whatever it was, when he was on board an American passenger plane flying from San Francisco to New York, he got the idea of seeking political asylum in the United States. Acting efficiently, the flight service personnel on board immediately reported Yang Guoqiang's wish to the authorities concerned and the plane made an emergency landing in Chicago. This news was reported by foreign communications media.

What will U.S. President Reagan's action be in such embarrassing circumstances? Of course he has been informed of what this Chinese diplomatic courier did. As revealed by the White House spokesman, Reagan is studying this matter attentively. It will not be impossible that this Chinese courier's request will be granted. Reagan was not embarrassed by a similar incident that happened not long ago -- the incident of Chinese female tennis player Hu Na in the United States. At that time the Chinese side lodged a series of strong protests with the U.S. authorities. In an arrogant manner however, the U.S. Government simply ignored these protests. Despite the serious deterioration of Sino-U.S. relations caused by the Hu Na incident, it seems that no protest whatsoever could affect Reagan.

It should be noted that Reagan is constantly testing how far he can strain the U.S.-China relationship without breaking it. This being the case, no wonder the United States has time and again shown demonstrative, nondeceptive goodwill to Taiwan, and it is not strange that the United States has often played crafty tricks in dealing with the question of providing supplies to China and the issue of U.S.-China trade. Reagan's action is based on the idea that his foreign partners need him more than he needs his foreign partners. The imperialists cannot change their old habits no matter how hard they try to show a smiling face. The truth of this has once again been proved by the U.S. authorities' contemptuous attitude toward China.

PRC'S 'STRUGGLE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT' NOTED

PM071002 Moscow TRUD in Russian 3 Dec 83 p 3

[Ye. Piskunov article in response to reader's letter: "The Employment Problem in China" -- first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] I have heard more than once that there is unemployment in the PRC. What is being done to find jobs for people?

M Gorbunov, Leningrad

The struggle against unemployment, which has now been a serious problem in China for more than two decades, is being accorded great attention by the country's present leadership. The Chinese magazine RENKOU YANJIU, concerning itself with the demographic problem, notes that the number of "people waiting for work" -- the term used there for the unemployed -- is growing annually in the PRC by 5-6 million. According to Western researchers' estimates, 12 percent of the able-bodied population of PRC cities are unemployed.

Among the reasons for unemployment many observers correctly cite the serious consequences of the economic "experiments" of the late fifties and the sixties. A considerable pool of surplus labor has been formed in the cities from young people returning from the countryside where they were forcibly sent "for reeducation" during the "cultural revolution" years and from a stream of former exiles. More than 900,000 people have returned just to Shanghai, one of the PRC's largest cities. In addition, the ranks of the unemployed are swelled annually by secondary school dropouts.

The practice of job placement which existed until recently in China has not helped to resolve the problem either. Enterprises were not allowed to recruit the cadres they needed, but the working people sought work independently.

The Chinese Government, concerned that unemployment among young people is creating a "generation of pessimistically minded people," has taken a number of measures aimed at "reviving" the economy and resolving the problem of job placement in cities.

One of these measures is the temporary placement of "young people waiting for work" in small cooperatives and private [yedinalichnyye] enterprises in the services sphere -- in canteens, small stores, and repair workshops. In Shanghai, for example, a whole "commercial district" where "young members of the intelligentsia" work has been created from these enterprises. All the enterprises were created without any outlay on the state's part through bank loans, savings, or donations.

One avenue for resolving this problem is the attempt to limit compulsory job placement and to introduce experimentally a system of "work by contracts." This March the PRC Ministry of Labor and Personnel distributed a special circular stipulating, in particular, that contracts are to be concluded for 3-5 years. Registration is voluntary. A system of tests and probationary periods will ensure the checking and selection of specialists. One aim of these measures is to do away with wage leveling and introduce wages dependent on labor productivity. As a result of these measures Beijing alone will obtain work for more than 20,000 people.

Measures such as lowering the pensionable age for workers and employees and extending women's statutory leave have also been mapped out so as to create a large number of jobs.

The all-China conference on finding work for urban youth and developing the cooperative and private sectors of the economy held in Beijing in August noted that the new course had already brought tangible results. In the last 5 years 38 million unemployed people have been found work. In the first 6 months of 1983 work was secured for another 2.5 million people. This is 300,000 more than in the comparable period last year. However, the problem of finding work for the population will remain quite critical for a long time yet, since it is expected that another 50 million people will be seeking work in China in the next few years.

CORRECTION TO REJOINDER ON WU'S KURILS REMARKS

The following correction should be made to the item entitled "PRAVDA Rejoinder Hits Wu's Remarks on Kurils" published in the China section of the 1 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page B 1:

In subslug, substitute "P. Dalnev" for "unattributed" (supplying name of author)

MONGOLIAN PEOPLE 'UNANIMOUSLY' BACK USSR POLICY

PM071518 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by Mongolian Foreign Minister M. Dugersuren: "There Is No More Important Task: The Mongolian People Unanimously Support the USSR's Foreign Policy Course"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, December -- The Mongolian public is following the development of events in the world with a sense of growing alarm and concern. The U.S. Administration's adventurist course of achieving military superiority over the USSR and pursuing an unrestrained arms race has brought mankind to the brink of nuclear catastrophe. In effect denying the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, the present White House chief has declared a "crusade" against socialism and publicly threatens to destroy it. Washington's policy, which is divorced from present-day realities and lacks common sense, is particularly dangerous since it is becoming unpredictable and increasingly assumes the nature of militarist hysteria. A vivid example of this is the shameful, piratical U.S. intervention in Grenada. This is such a reckless, arrogant act that the U.S. actions aroused condemnation even from the NATO allies.

The U.S. imperialists and leaders of a number of NATO countries who act in unison with them have embarked on the siting of American Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe, seeking to change the established equilibrium of forces in their own favor. In siting these lethal weapons close to the borders of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community states, the NATO strategists count on creating military superiority and dictating their own terms to the socialist countries from a position of strength. But such hopes are doomed to failure.

A profound, principled assessment of the prevailing international situation is given in the 24 November statement by Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It clearly sets forth the Soviet people's firm will to continue pursuing a consistent course of ending the arms race -- above all the nuclear arms race -- and lessening and eventually completely eliminating the threat of nuclear war.

The working people of People's Mongolia fully support and approve Yu. V. Andropov's statement, which is permeated with concern for mankind's peaceful future and testifies to the Soviet Union's unswerving resolve to defend world peace and safeguard the peoples of the socialist countries against encroachments by imperialist forces. This was stated by Yu. Tsedenbal, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, at the MPRP Central Committee Plenum which has just been held.

He noted that the siting of new American medium-range missiles in West Europe increases the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war and jeopardizes universal peace.

The Mongolian Government attaches great significance to the flexible, constructive nature of the Soviet leader's statement, which leaves the door open for agreement to be reached if the United States and the other NATO countries display readiness to return to the situation that existed before the siting of American medium-range missiles in Europe began.

The present world situation recalls the situation in the fifties, when the most reactionary U.S. circles were entertaining monstrous plans to unleash an atomic war against the socialist countries.

Only the Soviet Union's resolute stand and its measures to strengthen its defense might upset the aggressors' criminal designs. And today's actions by the Soviet state aimed at further ensuring the socialist community's security are also a guarantee of preserving peace and serve as a stern warning to the latter-day "crusaders."

In the maniacal desire to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the socialist countries, the American imperialists increasingly turn their gaze to Asia. The Far East and the Pacific, where the second largest grouping of U.S. Armed Forces abroad -- after Western Europe -- is concentrated, are viewed by the American military and an arena of future confrontation with the Soviet Union and other socialist states. A special place in the Pentagon's strategic plans is assigned to Japan, whose ruling circles are striving to revive militarism in the country, and also to South Korea.

U.S. attempts to knock together a trilateral military alliance, a kind of Asian version of NATO, were apparent during President Reagan's recent Far East trip. Japan's ruling circles make no secret of their satisfaction over the fact that his trip helped to strengthen the "bilateral military partnership" and make "American-Japanese allied relations" more "mature." On the other hand, the head of the Washington administration expressed the conviction that his visit opened up a "new era" in these relations. Indeed, like FRG Chancellor H. Kohl's visit to Tokyo, the American-Japanese talks helped to tie Japan more closely to the NATO nuclear strategy, which is already moving outside the framework of Europe and beginning to extend to the Far East.

It is noteworthy that in the course of his trip the White House chief broke every record for lies and hypocrisy. Calling himself a "champion of peace and nuclear disarmament," he called at the same time for using the Asian Continent as a forward border for a global anti-Soviet strategy and creating an aggressive triangle linking Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul, a triangle that will be directed against not only the socialist states but also the national interests of all Asian peoples and will constitute a serious threat to peace and security in the region.

Imperialist circles and their accomplices are striving persistently to exacerbate existing conflicts and kindle new ones in various parts of Asia. The U.S. military presence in the Near East is being stepped up and the undeclared war against the DRA goes on. Reactionary forces' encroachments on the independence and revolutionary gains of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea are still poisoning the international atmosphere. The United States' widening of the scale of its military aid to Pakistan, is leading toward destabilizing the situation in an extensive region of great strategic importance. Concern is aroused by imperialism's increasing political and economic pressure on the Republic of India, aimed at making that peace-loving power leave its nonaligned stance and weakening its role in the struggle to strengthen the cause of peace and security on the Asian Continent.

But every attempt by the imperialists to intimidate Asian countries with the non-existent "Soviet threat" and involve them in the arms race meets with growing opposition from those states' peoples. Despite reaction's intrigues, the forces that advocate national liberation and social progress are strengthening, the antiwar movement is growing, and real socialism and its achievements in all spheres of the economy and culture and its purposeful struggle to eliminate the threat of nuclear war are becoming an increasingly attractive example to millions of people. The public in Asian countries is clearly aware that collective security in the region can be achieved on the basis of the constructive peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

Concrete opportunities to normalize the situation in Southeast Asia are provided by the proposals of the SRV, Laos, and the PRK. Importance and topicality are attached to the struggle for the withdrawal of American troops from South Korea and that country's unification on a peaceful, democratic basis.

Following the same trend as the fraternal countries' initiatives, the well-known Mongolian proposal to conclude a convention on mutual nonaggression and the nonuse of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific was put forward. It was dictated by the very nature of the social system established by the Mongolian people more than 60 years ago and by our country's unchanging foreign policy course.

Mongolia has made a significant contribution to the struggle against imperialist expansion in Asia. Unfading significance is attached to the joint victory of Soviet-Mongolian troops in the Halhin Gol region in 1939, when the Japanese aggressors who had invaded Mongolia's territory suffered defeat. This major military success for the young socialist world served as a sobering lesson to militarist circles. This lesson of history should not be forgotten today.

Mongolia's proposal aims to help prevent war and armed conflicts in the extensive region of Asia and the Pacific. Every day the development of events in the region emphasizes the topicality of our initiative. It accords with the vital interests of all peace-loving forces and is directed against the threat of nuclear war and toward improving the situation on the continent.

In putting forward its proposal, Mongolia had in view above all the rich experience of the joint struggle of peoples and national forces in Asia against colonialists and interventionists. The spirit of this struggle must to this day serve to strengthen all progressive forces in the region and form the basis of their foreign policy.

There is no corner of our planet where people are not concerned with the problem of war and peace. This question has become truly global, and the resolution of all the other tasks facing countries and peoples depends on it. Preventing a nuclear conflagration that could consume all living things on earth -- that is the greatest task of our time. That is why it is necessary to rally and ensure unity of actions by all those who value the destiny of present and future generations.

Sensible forces that uphold man's prime right -- the right to life -- are multiplying and strengthening from day to day. The peoples' sacred will for peace is capable of stopping the nuclear madmen. Mongolia's working people, who are building socialism, believe this firmly.

MPR GIVES 'TOTAL APPROVAL' OF ANDROPOV STATEMENT

LDO71927 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Ulaanbaatar December 7 TASS -- The People's Great Hural of the People's Republic of Mongolia has expressed total approval of the principled firm and at the same time flexible approach by the Soviet leadership to the vital problem of eliminating the threat of war, which was expressed in Yuriy Andropov's statement. This is pointed out in the statement issued by the Mongolian People's Great Hural on the occasion of the commencement of deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe. The statement was adopted at the scheduled session of the supreme body of the state power of People's Mongolia, which opened here today.

The reckless step, which was taken by the present U.S. Administration and its NATO allies, the statement says, has resulted in the break-down of the Geneva talks and started a new, dangerous spiral of the arms race, increased the nuclear threat to the peoples of Europe and the whole world.

We representatives of the Mongolian people, the statement by the People's Great Hural of the People's Republic of Mongolia points out, declare, expressing its will, resolute support for the specific measures being taken by the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty member-states for ensuring the security of their countries and the whole socialist community, for preserving peace in Europe and all over the world.

USSR'S MARCHUK RECEIVES MONGOLIAN COUNTERPART

PM071141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, received M. (Dasha), first deputy chairman of the Mongolian State Committee for Science and Technology, on 5 December. Questions of further developing Soviet-Mongolian scientific and technical cooperation were discussed.

BANGLADESH 'GRIM ECONOMIC POSITION,' 'CRISIS'

PM071150 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 83 First Edition p 5

[Article by Veniamin Shurygin under the rubric "Answering a Reader's Query": "The Crisis Grows"]

[Text] N.I. Murin of Kostroma asks about the political situation in Bangladesh.

According to reports from Bangladesh, the situation in the country remains tense. A curfew is in operation in Dhaka and Chittagong and their streets are now heavily patrolled by troops and police. Political activity is banned and around 600 people, including a number of leaders of opposition parties, have been arrested. The military administration took these steps following the 28 November mass demonstration in the Bangladesh capital demanding the lifting of martial law and the transfer of power to elected representatives of the people -- demonstrations called by the major political parties. During the actions demonstrators clashed with police and the result was that people were killed or wounded.

The recent events are a symptom of the chronic political crisis which has been plaguing the country for many years. Since Bangladesh was formed in 1971 there have been about a dozen attempted or successful coups d'etat resulting in the deaths of two presidents -- Mujibur Rahman and Ziaur Rahman. The current regime headed by 53-year-old Lieutenant General H.M. Ershad came to power in March 1982, also as the result of a coup. The Constitution was suspended, martial law was introduced and political parties were banned.

In mid-November General Ershad announced the lifting of the ban on political activity and said that presidential elections would be held in May and parliamentary elections in November 1984. This, in his view, would have meant a transition to civilian rule. But the decision met with a determined protest on the part of the opposition, which comprises three groupings including a total of more than 30 political parties. Although different in character, they are all in favor of immediate parliamentary elections, the restoration of basic democratic rights and freedoms, and the release of political prisoners. As events show, these demands are supported by broad strata of the Bangladesh public.

As press organs note, the main cause of the unstable political situation in Bangladesh is the country's grim economic position and its financial dependence on the West, primarily the United States. Bangladesh has one of the lowest per capita incomes in the world. According to official figures, three-fourths of the country's population are languishing below the poverty line, and one-third of the able-bodied population has no work. Its foreign debt is \$3.5 billion. In the budget for the current fiscal year 80 percent of the appropriations for the government's national development program are met by foreign loans. Via international credit organizations the West is influencing the government's economic policy. It is assumed that it was under the IMF pressure that steps were taken to denationalize state enterprises, as a result of which last year the rate of industrial production was only 0.9 percent. Inflation is growing and the price of food and other essential goods is rising.

Situated in the delta of two great Asian rivers, the Ganges and Brahmaputra, the People's Republic of Bangladesh possesses favorable natural conditions for agricultural production. It is one of the main suppliers of jute for the world market and it has considerable stocks of natural gas. In short, it is the view of local economists that the country has all the objective conditions to ensure normal life for its population of 93 million.

The country's left-wing and democratic forces believe that the only way to considerably improve the people's living standard is to strengthen the country's political independence and economic self-sufficiency and to effect fundamental transformations in the economic sphere and the structure of society.

USSR-INDIA ECONOMIC LINKS 'CONSTANTLY EXPANDING'

LD080039 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] A meeting of the Soviet-Indian Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation has begun in Delhi. The two countries' delegations are headed by the commission's cochairmen -- Comrade Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Narasimha Rao, India's minister of foreign affairs. Here is a report by Dmitriy Biryukov, our correspondent in India.

[Biryukov] As the Indian press says, the Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation, which has been in existence for over 10 years, plays a significant role in strengthening mutually beneficial bilateral economic links. Noting the importance of the contribution of Soviet-Indian cooperation to the development of the Indian economy, THE TIMES OF INDIA emphasizes that over 70 industrial projects have been built in India with Soviet assistance.

It is to be noted that the economic links between our countries are constantly expanding. The construction of the Visakhapatnam Combine is proceeding successfully. Another important stage in the expansion of economic links has been the building with Soviet assistance of the giant Vindayachal thermal power station. One cannot fail either to mention the development of trade relations between the USSR and India. At present the trade turnover between our countries exceeds 30 billion rupees. This shows convincingly the fruitful development of our economic relations, which are based on trust and mutual benefit.

Speaking at the meeting of the Intergovernmental Commission, India's Minister of Foreign Affairs Narasimha Rao stressed that against the background of the alarming exacerbation of the international situation, Indian-Soviet links serve as a model of peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation between states with different socioeconomic systems and make a weighty contribution to strengthening peace and security.

REPORTAGE ON ARKHIPOV'S NEW DELHI VISIT

For Delhi coverage of the visit to India by Ivan Vasilyevich Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and reports on the Soviet-Indian Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation meetings that began in New Delhi on 6 December; see page E 1 of the India section in the 7 December South Asia DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

The protocol was signed by N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, and Hoang Trong Dai, SRV vice minister of foreign trade.

GDR, CSSR CONDEMN U.S. DEPLOYMENT IN EUROPE

LD071952 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Berlin December 7 TASS -- The policy of confrontation and arms race, pursued by the USA and its allies in NATO, has created the greatest threat to peace in the world since the end of World War Two. This was stated at a meeting in the GDR capital today between the General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, President of the State Council of the GDR Erich Honecker and member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, chairman of the Czechoslovak Government Lubomir Strougal. They resolutely condemned the deployment of new U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons, that has begun in the territory of the FRG and other countries of Western Europe.

Erich Honecker and Lubomir Strougal underscored the firm resolve of the GDR and Czechoslovakia to prevent the achievement of a military superiority over the socialist countries, and to do everything necessary for safeguarding their security. Simultaneously, they expressed the confidence that the socialist states, together with all the peace forces can eliminate the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and to secure a lasting peace in the world. The GDR and Czechoslovakia, it was pointed out during the meeting, in the alliance with the USSR and other socialist countries, will continue to do everything possible to resolve the crucial problem of today -- the question of war and peace -- in the interests of the present and future generations.

CSSR OFFICIALS, CUBA'S MALMIERCA ISSUE COMMUNIQUE

LD080038 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Prague December 7 TASS -- Czechoslovakia and Cuba fully support the statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Yuriy Andropov in connection with the start of the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. This is said in the communique on the official friendly visit to Czechoslovakia by Cuba's Foreign Minister Isidoro Malmierca. The foreign minister was received by the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Czechoslovak President Gustav Husak and Chairman of the government Lubomir Strougal, and held talks with Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia Bohuslav Chnoupek.

The document says that the sides welcome the constructive position of the USSR which is that if the USA and other NATO countries display readiness to return to the situation that existed prior to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, the USSR will also be prepared to do the same. The communique points out that the USSR's response measures to the belligerent and aggressive plans of the USA constitute a lawful act to defend the Soviet territory and the territories of other Warsaw Treaty member-states.

The sides categorically denounced the U.S. armed aggression against Grenada, which constitutes a gross violation of international law, the U.N. Charter and the sovereignty of an independent state. This barbarous act of violence perpetrated by an imperialist power against a small insular state, the communique says, has once again revealed the true face of the present U.S. Administration which stakes on political and military confrontation, and on fuelling conflicts in order to subject states and peoples to the interests of North American imperialism.

Czechoslovakia and Cuba condemn the aggressive assaults on Nicaragua and the continuing military threats against Cuba, as well as the suppression of the patriotic forces in El Salvador and Guatemala.

The ministers also expressed apprehensions in connection with the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East as a result of the aggressive policy of the USA.

OPENING OF MSZMP CENTRAL COMMITTEE SESSION NOTED

LD071531 Moscow TASS in English 1047 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Budapest December 7 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party has opened here today. It will review outstanding international issues and discuss guidelines for the national economic development plan and state budget for 1984.

SHULTZ-GENSCHER PRESS CONFERENCE DERIDED

LD080017 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Aleksey Grigoriyev commentary]

[Text] Bonn, 7 Dec (TASS) -- A press conference took place here upon completion of U.S. secretary of State George Shultz' lightening visit to Bonn. At the conference, Shultz and FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher answered journalists' questions. It became a ordy panegyric of the "agreement" between Bonn and Washington, and also of the West's "peacefulness."

Shultz alleged that the United States has made many "constructive proposals" at the Geneva talks, and has "often shown flexibility" in Geneva. Going against all logic and generally known facts proving that the United States deadlocked the Geneva talks, and then finally wrecked them by starting to deploy Pershing II's in the FRG, and cruise missiles in Britain and Italy, the State Department head said that "the other side continually deployed its missiles, but the United States did not."

He also tried in all sorts of ways to justify the aggressive actions of Washington in the Central American region and in Lebanon. However, the toga of the "peacemaker" could not at all hide the military uniform: "If they commit violence against us in Lebanon, we are forced to defend ourselves, and shall continue to do so," Shultz stated.

Alleging that "there is no U.S. military presence in Central America," he gave an assurance of the intention of the Reagan administration "to guarantee the peoples of the region the development of democracy and security from those who are trying to violate a social progress." But here the secretary of state did not refrain himself from exposing the real intentions of the United States: "Of course, we are also giving a signal that we are capable of drawing up our forces in this region."

The visit by the United States secretary of state of Bonn once again confirms that Washington intends to continue trying to gain from its NATO allies unquestioning submission to its course, masking this with statements about "full agreement" between the parties.

BELGIUM SAID FEELING U.S. PRESSURE FOR DEPLOYMENT

LD072137 Moscow TASS in English 2110 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Brussels December 7 TASS -- The U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who came here to attend the upcoming NATO Council session, tried to pressurise the Belgian Government into agreeing as soon as possible to deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in Belgium.

As it became known here, this question, which is still being postponed by official Brussels, was discussed during George Shultz's meetings with Belgian Prime Minister W. Martens and Minister for External Relations L. Tindemans.

In the finformed quarters of the Belgian capital it is reported that the USA is threatening Belgium with economic sanctions if it refuses to decide in favour of missiles deployment. Besides, Washington is angered by the Belgian Government intention to somewhat reduce its military spending because of financial difficulties experienced by the country.

CPSU, DKP DELEGATIONS HIT U.S. 'MILITARISTS'

PM071044 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Nov 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting took place on 5 December between B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, M.V. Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and V.V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, and a German Communist Party, [DKP] delegation consisting of H. Mies, chairman of the DPK, H. Gautier, deputy chairman of the DKP, and K.H. Schroeder, member of the DKP board presidium and secretariat.

In the course of the talk which took place, the CPSU and DKP representatives exchanged information on their parties' activity and discussed a series of topical political issues. They expressed profound concern at the sharp exacerbation of the international situation, manifested anew in the commencement of the deployment of the new American Pershing II and cruise nuclear missiles in the FRG and a number of other West European countries. This act, which is hostile to the cause of peace and is aimed at undermining the existing approximate equilibrium of military forces in Europe between the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO states, increases the threat of the outbreak of nuclear catastrophe.

In this connection the substantial responsibility of the FRG Government for this turn of events was pointed out. By agreeing to the siting of new American nuclear missiles on West German territory, it is turning its country into a launchpad for first-strike weapons and a hostage to the U.S. militarists. The danger of a world war being unleashed from German soil is increased. All this cannot fail to have a negative effect on the development of Soviet-West German relations and the political climate in Europe.

The participants in the meeting noted that in the situation which is emerging there is an increasingly pressing need to step up the actions of all people of good will, of the people's masses, against the arms race and the siting of American missiles, in defense of peace, and for safeguarding the security of the present and future generations. Here special responsibility rests with the communist and workers parties, which are a powerful factor in the struggle against imperialism's aggressive policy.

The DKP delegation voiced its full support for the 24 November 1983 statement by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the measures it sets forth aimed at preventing the disruption of the military equilibrium which has long objectively served the cause of European security and stability.

On the Soviet side, it was stressed that the Soviet Union's retaliatory measures are forced on it and pursue no goal other than that of neutralizing the consequences of the adventurist policy of Washington and certain of its NATO allies and ensuring the security of the USSR and the other socialist community countries and of all the European peoples. If the United States and the other NATO countries display readiness to return to the situation which existed prior to the start of the siting of American medium-range missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union will also be prepared to do so.

The CPSU and DKP representatives expressed their conviction that present-day militarism's adventurist actions will not change the world correlation of forces. Ultimately the forces of reason, which express the people's vital interests, will succeed, through energetic actions, in removing the threat of war and safeguarding mankind against nuclear catastrophe.

In the course of the talk the CPSU's solidarity with Communists and all other forces in the FRG that stand for peace and its fraternal solidarity with the DKP's struggle for the socioeconomic and democratic rights of West German working people was reaffirmed.

The CPSU and DKP representatives stated their desire to continue to strengthen ties and contacts between the two parties.

The meeting took place in the atmosphere of fraternal friendship which is characteristic of mutual relations between the CPSU and the DKP.

EEC RIFT 'PLAYS INTO WASHINGTON'S HANDS'

LD080035 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes.

By sensational headlines "Collapse of Western Europe", "Utter Deadlock", "Bitter Failure", "And End to the Idea of Integrated Western Europe" and other such headings the press of Western countries announced today the utter failure of the three-day summit meeting of the EEC countries that was held in Athens. According to the French LIBERATION everybody in the West expected that the meeting will have "bad results", but what happened is beyond every limit, is utter catastrophe. Many observers are united in the opinion that the participants in the meeting were in accord only in one thing that they failed to reach agreement on any question of the agenda.

There were always differences among the EEC members but it is not accidental that they reached such acuteness precisely at a given moment. Though the contradictions on the problems of the farm policy of the Common Market and budgetary questions are profound they are only a tip of the iceberg, the consequence of the concealed, even more serious processes that stem from the close dependence of the Ten on the overall economic policy of the United States. It is no secret that many of the present woes of the Common Market countries are connected precisely with the policy of the Reagan administration which is seeking to overcome the crisis of the U.S. economy at the expense of its West European partners.

The economic potentials of the United States and Western Europe are now practically equal, while for many indexes, including the volume of foreign trade and currency reserves, the Common Market countries surpass the United States. In principle Washington for a long time now has no right to dictate its will to Western Europe. Nevertheless the United States leaders are dictating and imposing on Western Europeans the economic measures which are beneficial above all for the U.S. economy. The United States artificially appreciates the dollar and increases the bank rates which does a serious damage to the Common Market countries. For instance, the settlements for oil in the international market are conducted only in dollars and the dollar artificially increases in value. As a result of the high bank rates the flow of capital from Western Europe to the United States is continuing and this in turn leads to the curtailment of business activity in the EEC countries and to the increase of unemployment. There are 12 million unemployed in the Common Market countries already now and by official predictions the number of the unemployed in the EEC countries will soon increase to 15 million. The Reagan administration doubled the tariffs and imposed quotas on special grades of steel imported from Western Europe.

Meanwhile the United States demands that the EEC countries make much easier the access to U.S. products to Western Europe.

In the United States the produce from three fifths of farm lands is export oriented, 80 percent of the work force employed at enterprises of processing industry is connected with export deliveries also to Western Europe. Meanwhile only 15 percent of the overall export of the EEC is to the United States. In its economic ties with Western Europe the United States on purpose shakens the foundations of the Common Market. As former French Minister of Foreign Trade Jobert said yesterday in the television programme "Antenne-2" the United States uses Europe's weakness. It would be disadvantageous for the United States if Europe became a competitor in the economic aspect.

On the whole the division among the ten European countries plays into Washington's hands since a political paralysis of the EEC makes it easier for Washington to impose on Western Europe the political and economic recipes of the Reagan administration.

SHITIKOV HOLDS 'FRANK EXCHANGE' WITH UK OFFICIAL

LD071444 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS -- Today Aleksey Shitikov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received a delegation of the "Labour Action for Peace" organisation (Britain) led by William McKelvey, chairman of the organisation, a deputy of Parliament.

They had a frank exchange of views on vitally important problems in removing the threat of a nuclear war and ending the arms race. Pointed out were the baleful consequences of deployment of new U.S. missiles in a number of West European countries for the cause of peace and security of the peoples as well as in this connection a great importance of the statement by Yuriy Andropov who emphasised that the Soviet leadership, fulfilling the will of the people, will continue to do everything to avert the threat of war and to preserve peace for the present and future generations.

UK SAID YIELDING TO U.S. ON LEBANON ISSUE

LD080008 Moscow TASS in English 2322 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] London December 7 TASS -- Despite the demands of the British public, of the Labour opposition in the House of Commons and the increase of dissatisfaction within the ruling Conservative Party Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher refused to consider the question of the withdrawal of the British military contingent from Lebanon. Speaking in the House of Commons she said outright today that the British forces will remain in Lebanon. The head of the British Government tried to justify the continuation of the British military presence in Lebanon by saying that the Lebanese community will be alarmed in the extreme if Britain withdraws its forces from Lebanon.

It is remarkable that the statement of the British premier was made several hours after the talks between special envoy of the U.S. President in the Middle East Donald Rumsfeld and British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary Geoffrey Howe. It is openly pointed out here in this connection that London was again compelled to yield to the pressure of Washington which is striving at any cost to keep its European allies in Lebanon, to create the impression of unity within NATO and to cover up by the signboard of "multinational forces" Washington's impudent interference in Lebanon's affairs.

KOIVISTO GREETED ON FINNISH INDEPENDENCE DAY

PM080937 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 83 Morning Edition p 1

[Text] To his Excellency Mr Mauno Koivisto, president of Finland

On behalf of the Soviet people we sent you, Mr President, and the friendly Finnish people cordial congratulations on the 66th Anniversary of the declaration of Finland's independence. We note with profound satisfaction that friendship and good-neighbourliness have become firmly established in Soviet-Finnish relations, which have been developing fruitfully for 35 years now on the unshakable foundation of the 1948 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Aid. The pre-expiry extension of the treaty for a further 20-year period convincingly attests to the firm intention of the USSR and Finland to continue and deepen the line of friendship, trust, and all-around cooperation for the good of both countries' peoples and make their contribution to strengthening peace and security in Europe. Following this tried and tested course, the USSR and Finland will undoubtedly continue to demonstrate the fruitfulness and prospects of the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, which is especially important in the present exacerbated international situation.

We wish you, esteemed Mr President, and our good neighbor -- the Finnish people -- successes, prosperity, and peace.

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

PCI STATEMENT ON U.S. ROLE IN LEBANON CITED

LD062009 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Text] Rome December 6 TASS -- Operations of U.S. planes against the positions of the Syrian forces in Lebanon represent a new dangerous step in the armed aggression, power politics conducted by the United States in Lebanese crisis, says a statement of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party published here. The statement stresses that the Reagan administration opposes achievement of an agreement on national reconciliation in Lebanon and took the road of "strategic agreement" with Israel. Reagan's aggressive policy leads to further aggravation of the conflict, to the danger of its being spread, the statement says.

The Italian Communist demand that Italy's Government condemn the United States' military action, its striving to involve in its actions "multinational peace-keeping force" in Lebanon, the statement says. The Italian Communist Party declares for the immediate withdrawal of the Italian contingent from Lebanon, the statement stresses.

EGYPT CRITICIZES U.S. POLICY IN MIDEASTMubarak Hits U.S.-Israeli Pact

LD072028 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 7 Dec 83

[From "The World Today" Program presented by political observer Boris Kalyagin]

[Excerpts] The pirate attack by U.S. war planes against positions of the Syrian troops has provoked literally a storm of protest. The raid was decided upon during Shamir's recent trip to the United States. Even Egypt, the partner of Washington and Tel Aviv in the Camp David deal, has become alarmed. Egyptian President Mubarak has stated that the agreement between the United States and Israel will be an obstacle on the road to peace. In order to try and soothe his ally, Reagan has had to hastily dispatch his special Near East emissary, Rumsfeld, to Cairo. Well, he will have a fair amount to do there. After Cairo he will also have to soothe Riyadh and Amman since there has been condemnation in Saudi Arabia and Jordan of the U.S.-Israeli alliance. So Rumsfeld's mission, to put it bluntly, is not easy: to prevent the United States as an impartial mediator in Near East affairs. The attack by the U.S. Air Force demonstrably showed what the real role of the U.S. Armed Forces is in Lebanon. They are there not for keeping the peace at all, but to impose on that country by military force the U.S.-Israeli ultimatum.

Deputy Foreign Minister's Criticism

LD072357 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Leonid Rassadin dispatch from Cairo]

[Text] For the first time since the Camp David agreement, Egypt has sharply criticized U.S. Near East policy. Evidence of this is provided by a statement published in the local press by Usamah al-Baz, head of the Egyptian president's political secretariat and first deputy foreign minister. He had returned to Cairo from Washington, where he had several meetings with U.S. officials. They discussed the situation created in the Near East as a result of the recent agreements on U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation and the escalation of U.S. military actions in Lebanon. Usamah al-Baz noted that, in Egypt's view, the agreement between Washington and Tel Aviv has not only created a new obstacle to peace in the region, but also reflects full U.S. support for Israel.

It is perfectly obvious that this is, practically, the end of the U.S. role as mediator in the search for a Near East settlement. The current U.S. policy in the region, Usamah al-Baz said, proves that Washington has decided to conclude a military-political pact with Israel, despite the continuing Israeli occupation of Arab lands -- the territory of Syria, Lebanon and Palestine.

PRC 'STRONGLY CONDEMNS' U.S. MIDEAST ACTION

LD072157 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Dec 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] The Chinese press has published a statement by a spokesman for the PRC Foreign Ministry which says, in part:

Recently, U.S. and Israeli aircraft have subjected Syrian and PLO positions in Lebanon to bombing, which has lead to a further increase in tension in the Middle East. The PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman said the PRC strongly condemns these raids.

A RENMIN RIBAO commentary, which looks at the expansion of U.S. military interference in this region in the context of increasing rivalry with the other superpower, notes that the Chinese people strongly condemn such U.S. action, which harms the cause of peace throughout the world. The United States must immediately cease its military interference in Middle East affairs.

SHULTZ UPHOLDS U.S. 'POLICY OF TERROR'

LDO72132 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS -- Before flying to Europe U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz held a press conference in Washington. At that press conference he, specifically, tried to justify Washington's aggressive policy in Lebanon. Demagogically asserting that the United States, allegedly, is compelled to act since it is protecting U.S. soldiers staying in Lebanon, Shultz openly threatened Lebanese national patriotic forces and Syria with new military actions. He thus confirmed the course of the United States at crude pressure with regard to those forces that oppose U.S. diktat and Washington's aggressive policy in the Middle East.

Seeking to justify the United States' aggressive actions in Lebanon Shultz asserted that a U.S. contingent is staying in Lebanon at the "request of the lawful government and observes the norms of conduct established by the government. Since the conduct of U.S. military in Lebanon is manifested in the massacres of peaceful people, bombing and shelling of residential areas of Beirut and other such actions it becomes absolutely clear again that Mr Shultz is upholding the policy of terror in relations against other states and governments.

Shultz tried in so many words to assert that the United States, don't you see, has a right to "self-defence" and will be protecting itself in Lebanon. One might ask against whom will it be protecting itself? The U.S. military together with the Israeli military has invaded the land of others, is occupying it, is staging massacres of peaceful people, is imposing an occupation regime and the secretary of state meanwhile describes all this as "self-defence". U.S. Navy brazenly invaded the territorial waters of Lebanon, brought a landing force that got entrenched on the territory of an independent state and is implementing an armed interference in its internal affairs. Such is the "lawful action" about which Mr Shultz is talking. No this is not a "legal action" at all, but an outright aggression against a sovereign state and no one can conceal this fact no matter how the stay of the U.S. forces in that country is presented.

The President of the United States said at one time that it was allegedly necessary to send U.S. forces to Lebanon for establishing order there and that those forces will stay for a short period, not longer than several weeks. No mention is made of this now. The contingent of U.S. forces has been sharply increased. It got entrenched on Lebanon's territory and is conducting large-scale armed operations against the Lebanese people.

U.S. Marines, just as other U.S. forces, are staying in Lebanon so that according to Shultz's statement, to ensure those aspects of the United States foreign policy that are related to the Middle East. And since Lebanon is occupied both by U.S. and Israeli it follows that the United States conducts the same policy in the Middle East as Israel and, moreover, jointly with Israel. This policy contradicts the all-embracing settlement of the Middle East problem.

It serves the interests and goals of U. S. monopolies, is aimed at subjugating to U.S. and Zionist domination one Middle Eastern state after another.

Such is the policy which Shultz describes as the policy of "restoration of the status of a sovereign state." This is nothing but cynicism and demagoguery and the U.S. secretary of state resorted to them to try to cover up the dirty crimes staged by the U.S. military against the Lebanese and Syrian peoples. No verbiage and subterfuges can conceal from the world public the fact that the aggressive sortie of the U.S. military is a result of further widening of the United States' interference in internal Lebanese affairs coordinated with the actions of the Israeli aggressors that have committed horrible crimes against Middle Eastern Arab countries. What now happens in Lebanon is a result of a piratic collusion that the United States and Israel formed during the recent meeting between Reagan and Shamir in Washington.

U.S. TROOPS IN LEBANON AS 'TROJAN HORSE'

LD062224 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Commentary by Boris Andrianov]

[Text] Recent events in Lebanon have hardly given cause for celebration to objective observers of the situation in that Arab country. It has been impossible for to foresee what role the U.S. Marines, provided with powerful support by a whole squadron of naval vessels, have been called upon to play on Lebanese territory. Taking a common sense view of the situation it must be concluded that Washington intended to use its armed forces there as a Trojan horse disguised, in the present U.S. style, as peace-keeping envoys from the Reagan administration trying to present themselves as disinterested mediators in Near Eastern affairs.

The bandit attack by the U.S. air pirates on Lebanon has now shown the world what Washington's real aims in that country are. The explosions of the barbarous bombing have removed all trace of the disguise, the mask of the U.S. peace mission in the Near East. Now the White House is trying to justify its criminal action by insolvent arguments alleging that it is necessary to protect its Marines in Lebanon. Well, who forced anyone to send U.S. Marines there? Were they invited by the Lebanese, whom they are now shelling? No, there is no doubt that the U.S. Marines are akin to the Israeli aggressors insofar as they are acting in Lebanon as occupationists and interventionists who have brought much harm to the peoples of this country.

By the way, Washington has now given up all its hypocritical attempts to disown the aggressive actions of the Israeli aggressors in Lebanon. President Reagan himself publicly declared that the United States would act in concert with Israel. This is the direct result of the dangerous plot between Washington and Tel Aviv aimed at expanding their military-political cooperation in the Near East. Such a U.S.-Israeli deal contains a serious threat not only to Lebanon but to other countries of the region. For the Reagan administration is not concerned for the legitimate interests and rights of the Arab peoples. The White House has no desire for a just and firm peace in the Near East as it expands its armed interference in this region. The bandit-like actions of the United States show that it now intends to subordinate the whole Near Eastern region to its military-political control, putting pressure by force on those who oppose Tel Aviv's expansionism and Washington's dictate.

Such plans represent a danger to peace not only in the Near East. This should be taken into account by the U.S. Government.

U.S., ISRAEL COOPERATE IN 'PIRACY, PILLAGE'

LD072248 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The American Marine contingent making the backbone of the so-called Multinational Force in Lebanon shelled once again on 6 December areas adjacent to Beirut International Airport. Tank guns and guided missiles were used. Here are more details:

This military action was undertaken under the same invented pretext of ensuring the Marines' safety, but in reality, as Lebanese observers believe, American and Israeli air raids on Lebanon, massive bombardments of the Syrian contingent staying in Lebanon on the invitation of its government, are part of the preparations of the U.S. and its ally, Israel, for a large-scale aggression against Syria and the national patriotic forces of Lebanon.

Correspondents report that in view of the increasing threat of a new war, many Lebanese have to leave the country via the seaport, since the international airport in Beirut has been idle for a week already. Business activity has slackened in the capital and many other Lebanese cities. One cannot help but notice a direct connection between the escalation of military operations in Lebanon by the United States and the decisions taken in Washington during the recent visit there of the Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhaq Shamir. The visit marked a new stage in the strategic cooperation between the U.S. and Israel prone to more killings, destruction and arbitrary ways.

Crude force has now become the main if not the only instrument of American policies in the Middle East. Therefore, more latest American weapons will be added to the Israeli arsenals and the port of Haifa will be turned into a permanently operating base of the American 6th Fleet, and the joint military exercises will be designed to intimidate the unvanquished.

American-Israeli cooperation has been crowned with the establishment of a bilateral military and political committee, a kind of coordinating center for piracy and pillage in the region. So, as one American commentator put it, the American big stick and the watchdog, the Israeli army, have been combined. And what consequences will this act of combining have for the region? One of them will be Israel's tougher occupationist policy in the south of Lebanon and the escalation of the American presence in that country. Israel will also continue colonizing the West Bank and the Gaza and will be trying once again to break the Syrian barrier in the way of its expansion. Now it is absolutely clear that there are two aggressors, the United States and Israel.

Political foolhardy combined with annexationist and imperial ambitions: Such is the essence of a new stage of the anti-Arab conspiracy, which has caused a sharp aggravation of the situation in Lebanon.

U.S. 'SETTING UP' RDF CENTER IN GULF REGION

LD062258 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 6 Dec 83

[Excerpts] The Pentagon is setting up a mobile headquarters for the Rapid Deployment Force on board one of the American warships in the Arab Gulf.

The intention of the Reagan administration to establish the headquarters of the U.S. intervention forces in a strategically important region indicates the general orientation of Washington's policy in the Middle East which has been declared a zone of vital U.S. interest.

But if the point at issue is so-called interests of a state located thousands of kilometers from the Middle East and the Arab Gulf, what then would one say about countries adjacent to this region? The places where the United States establishes its military presence are a stone's throw from the Soviet Union. For its part the Soviet Union has stated that the deployment of U.S. forces, including nuclear ones, near its borders cannot but be a source of concern for the Soviet Union. Together with its allies it is right to say that the situation in the Middle East concerns their important vital interests, but the Soviet Union has never shown any intention to protect these interests with military intervention. It is in this, precisely, that the main difference lies as regards security or the issues related to it.

The U.S. tactics come down to creating hotbeds of tension in various regions and therefore to massing its armed forces near the region in question or directly in it. These tactics are used for achieving long-term strategic objectives. The U.S. seeks to drown Lebanon in blood, to destroy the national liberation movement of the Middle East peoples and to create conditions for a large-scale intervention in other countries in the Arab world too. The provocations of the U.S. forces against the Syrian units of the Arab deterrent forces to keep peace in Lebanon are convincing evidence of this.

Everything indicates that the mobile headquarters of the Rapid Deployment Force in the Arab Gulf will be nothing but a center for planning and carrying out fresh acts of aggression in the Middle East.

USSR'S OGARKOV MAKES 'FRIENDLY VISIT' TO ALGERIA

Departs Moscow

PM071108 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Dec 83 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On a Friendly Visit"]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, left Moscow 6 December on an official friendly visit to Algeria.

At the airport, Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov was seen off by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.I. Petrov and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense ministers; and by Army General V.I. Varennikov and Admiral N.N. Amelko, deputy chiefs of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

M. Ait Chalal, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the popular and Democratic Republic of Algeria to the USSR, was also among those who saw him off.

Talks Begin

LD071357 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Algiers December 7 TASS -- Questions of mutual interest are being discussed at the negotiations which are under way between a Soviet delegation, now on an official friendly visit to Algeria, and political and military leadership of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic.

The Soviet delegation is led by Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR, First Deputy Defence Minister of the USSR Marshal of the Soviet Union Nikolay Ogarkov.

Yesterday the head of the Soviet delegation laid a wreath to the monument in memory of the heroes who lost their lives in the course of the Algerian peoples' armed struggle for independence.

Algerian Reportage

For Algerian media coverage of the visit to Algeria by the delegation led by Marshal of the Soviet Union Nikolay Ogarkov, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, including reportage on audiences with Dr Ahmed Taleb Ibrahimi, minister of foreign affairs, and Mohamed Cherif Messaadia, member of the National Liberation Front (FLN) Political Bureau, see the Algeria section of the 7 December Middle East and Africa DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

CPSU'S BRUTENTS MEETS WITH MOROCCAN LEADERS

Discusses Party Ties

PM071139 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Contacts"]

[Text] Rabat, 6 Dec -- K.N. Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, who is here for the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Moroccan Communist Party, had a meeting with Abderrahim Bouabid, first secretary of the Socialist Union of Popular Forces (USFP).

The sides stressed that the resolute struggle against the danger of war and militarism's aggressive intrigues is today's most important task for all peace-loving forces. They expressed concern over the explosive situation in the Near East and condemned the anti-Arab strategic alliance between the United States and Israel.

The sides expressed the mutual desire to develop contacts and ties between the CPSU and the USFP.

Addresses Holiday Ceremony

PM071550 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "To Mark Anniversary"]

[Text] Rabat, 5 Dec -- Ali Yata, secretary general of the Moroccan Party of Progress and Socialism (PPS), has delivered the report at a ceremonial session held in the city of Casablanca to mark the 40th anniversary of the Moroccan Communist Party. The birth of the party of Moroccan Communists, he said, was the natural result of profound internal and external political and socioeconomic processes. Its creation was promoted by the formation of the country's working class, the growth of the class awareness of the people's masses, the Soviet Union's victory over Hitlerite fascism, and the general upsurge of the world national liberation movement.

Despite the persecutions, repressions, and arrests, A. Yata continued, the Moroccan Communist Party not only preserved its militancy and viability but also emerged strengthened from its ordeals. Its prestige was asserted as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class and all working people of the country.

The PPS, the heir to the Moroccan Communist Party's political, ideological, and organizational line, he continued, has now become an influential force in Morocco. It is steadily guided by the principles of scientific socialism and proletarian internationalism. The PPS is strengthening its combat solidarity with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, the working class of the capitalist countries, and the national liberation and anti-imperialist movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The PPS, the speaker stressed, advocates the unity of the Arab patriotic forces opposing imperialist-Zionist aggression and the United States' plans aimed at establishing its hegemony in the Near East and appropriating its natural resources. The party expresses solidarity with the struggle of the Arab Palestinians for the implementation of their inalienable national rights under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative -- the PLO.

The Soviet Union, the PPS secretary general stated, is the leading force for in the present-day struggle for the conservation of peace throughout the world, for disarmament, and for the prevention of the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war. Full responsibility for the sharp aggravation of the international situation rests with the forces of imperialism, primarily the United States. The initiation of the deployment of the new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe has made it impossible to continue the talks in Geneva, which Washington was exploiting to mislead world public opinion. In the face of the imperialist circles' aggressive aspirations, the speaker emphasized, Morocco cannot remain an onlooker, but must make its contribution to the defense of peace on earth.

Touching on the domestic situation in Morocco, the PPS leader noted the profound socio-economic and financial crisis the country is experiencing. He pointed to the need for unity among Moroccan leftwing forces with a view to effectively satisfying the working masses' vital interests and ensuring genuine democracy and social progress.

Addressing the ceremonial meeting, K.N. Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department who was attending the jubilee celebrations as the CPSU's representative, read out the message from the CPSU Central Committee to the PPS Central Committee on the Moroccan Communist Party's 40th anniversary.

KUZNETSOV PRESENTS AWARD TO CUBAN ENVOY

PM071251 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Presentation of Soviet Award"]

[Text] On 5 December in the Kremlin V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presented the Order of the Friendship of the Peoples to R. Anillo Capote, Cuban ambassador to the USSR.

V.V. Kuznetsov warmly and cordially congratulated the ambassador on the lofty award marking his vigorous work to strengthen friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Cuba.

"The most important factor assuring the firmness and indestructibility of Soviet-Cuban relations," V.V. Kuznetsov said, "are the constant ties between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Cuba based on the firm foundation of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. Special importance for deepening and expanding these relations attaches to the close contacts between Comrades Yu.V. Andropov and Fidel Castro."

R. Anillo Capote expressed profound thanks for the high assessment of his activity. He stressed that he attributes this award to his motherland, which is tirelessly concerned with the consolidation of fraternal ties with the Soviet Union. The friendship of our countries and peoples, the ambassador said, is based on the commonality of their goals and has been cemented by the joint struggle for the ideals of peace and progress. That is why it is indestructible.

The recipient of the award was also congratulated by T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; O.B. Rakhmanin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; L.F. Ilcheyev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

On the same day a warm, friendly talk took place between V.V. Kuznetsov and R. Anillo Capote in which T.N. Menteshashvili, O.B. Rakhmanin, and L.F. Ilcheyev took part.

CIA ENGINEERING 'SABOTAGE' IN NICARAGUA

LD080050 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1608 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Managua, 7 Nov (TASS) -- The CIA has engineered a fresh act of subversion in Sandino Port, Nicaragua. As Jaime Wheelock, member of the national leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front and minister of agricultural development and agrarian reform, told a mass rally in the city of Leon, a sabotage squad that was brought to the shores of Nicaragua in an American ship penetrated the port and blew up the system of oil pipelines used for unloading liquid fuel from tanker ships arriving at the Port of Sandino.

The port has now twice been the target of bandit attacks by the U.S. mercenaries. The first explosion of the oil pipeline engineered by CIA agents inflicted damage amounting to more than \$300,000. Acts of terrorism engineered by the U.S. espionage department this year have also been targeted on the Nicaraguan ports of Corinto, Cabezas, and Benjamin Celedon.

J. Wheelock stressed that in the event of a direct American aggression against the republic, its entire people led by the Sandinist National Liberation Front will fight to the last man against the interventionists.

The American troops in Honduras, together with the reactionary military of that country, are preparing an armed invasion of the Nicaraguan department of Zelaya, Jose Gonzalez, spokesman of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs in the first special zone, told correspondents. He said that recently there have been more frequent assaults by the counterrevolutionaries, who are being concentrated on Honduran territory near the border with Nicaragua. In November alone, foreign aircraft intruded more than 20 times into Nicaraguan airspace in the Zelaya region. Ten Nicaraguan fishing vessels were subjected to piratic attacks at sea.

Jose Gonzalez said that, in the last 4 months, more than 150 mercenaries have been killed during armed clashes in Zelaya.

U.S. 'TAKING STEPS' TO PERPETUATE GRENADA STAY

LD080004 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Nikolay Chigir writes:

All-without-exception "arguments" with which the Washington Administration manipulated in an attempt to "justify" and "substantiate" the U.S. armed invasion of Grenada are mendacious from beginning to end. This is the conclusion which foreign political observers arrive at, analyzing the developments on the island in the almost one and a half months that have passed since the bandit action. At present there remains not a shadow of doubt that Reagan's "Grenada operation" pursued the aim of stifling the revolution on Grenada and of depriving its people of the freedom and independence gained by them, and turning the island into a colonial possession of U.S. imperialism.

Armed terror and violence are the main means which the Washington leadership uses to attain this goal, just as to carry out its other foreign-policy designs. It is by means of them that the U.S. military that commit excesses on Grenada try to take the love of freedom out of the Grenadians and to make them forget about the very existence of the right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty. Despite the most tough censorship introduced by the U.S. occupation authorities, reports on savage reprisals being staged on the island by modern colonizers filter into the foreign press.

Indiscriminate round-ups and searches accompanied with mass arrests have become an everyday occurrence on Grenada. Each Grenadian suspected of disagreement with the 'order and democracy', Reagan style, is flung by Pentagon soldiers into police dungeons and into concentration camps which have been set up after the recipes of Chilean fascist Pinochet and his Hitlerite predecessors. The prisoners are subjected to savage physical and psychological treatment. The number of the arrested, killed and tortured to death grows continuously. At present the U.S. military authorities are also preparing a prosecution of political prisoners, although, according to the U.S. CHICAGO TRIBUNE, no charges have been even brought against them.

Washington, pursuing a policy of monstrous repressions which are designed to reduce the Grenadians to the position of meek slaves, at the same time is speeding up work to turn Grenada into a permanent U.S. military base.

III. 8 Dec 83

K 3

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

The U.S. press itself draws attention to the fact that the Reagan administration by no means intends to withdraw its troops from Grenada, although previously it did give assurances that they would leave the island by December 23.

The plans to infinitely prolong the occupation of Grenada are also evidenced by statements made by official Washington spokesmen. U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger in an interview with the CNN television network has stated an intention to leave about 2,000 soldiers of engineer troops on the island for an indefinite time to participate in reconstruction and building of some facilities. Larry Speakes, deputy press secretary of the White House, has pronounced still more frankly. He admitted that Washington is planning to keep a U.S. certain military presence on Grenada by leaving there not only "builders" but also units for the maintenance of law and order.

The U.S. Administration, as we see, continues to follow the path of most flagrant violation of elementary norms of international law and of the principles of the U.N. Charter. By taking steps to perpetuate the occupation of Grenada and to convert the island into a U.S. military base, Washington again impudently defies the entire world community whose will is expressed in the U.N. General Assembly's resolution which contains resolute demands for an immediate withdrawal of all occupation troops from Grenada.

BARKAUSKAS DEPARTS FOR ARGENTINA INAUGURATION

LD071712 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] A USSR delegation led by Comrade Barkauskas, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left Moscow for Buenos Aires to take part in ceremonies connected with the inauguration of President Alfonsin.

RSFSR SUPREME SOVIET SESSION SET FOR 6 JAN

LD071229 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 7 Dec 83

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has decided to convene the eighth session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 10th convocation on 6 January 1984 in Moscow.

IDEOLOGICAL LAXITY IN UKRAINIAN MINISTRY NOTED

WA301315 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 83 Second Edition p 2

[Article by A. Kapto, secretary of the CPUk Central Committee: "In the Vanguard of Creative Unions -- Ideological Work Is the Job of Every Communist"]

[Excerpts] When one looks closely at the materials on the June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, one is struck again and again by the depth and precision of the analysis of the most important processes taking place in the life of Soviet society, in all spheres of the party's ideological and mass political work, and in particular, in the sphere of cultural development and artistic creativity. The plenum's decisions have set goals for thousands of communists working today in creative unions, and arts and cultural institutions; they are the militant vanguard of our artistic intelligentsia and its political nucleus.

An analysis of the processes taking place in the cultural life of the Ukraine offers evidence of the increased role of literature and art in the intellectual life of our republic's workers. This context gives a special meaning to the words of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov: "As the cultural level of the people rises, the effect of art on the minds of people grows stronger. At the same time the possibilities for art's active interference in public life also increase. This means that artists have a much greater responsibility to see that the powerful tool they hold is used to serve the people and the work of communism." Communists in creative collectives and their party organizations are taking primary responsibility for this.

Party committees in the republic are striving to create a definite system for working with the artistic intelligentsia, combining a considerate, respectful attitude toward talent with high principles and exactingness. The party has a wide range of means and methods for influencing the creative process. First and foremost, of course, there are diverse forms for individual work with masters of art and literature, taking into consideration the unique creative features of the artist, his character, disposition, and relationships with colleagues.

Regular meetings held by members of the bureau and secretaries of oblast party committees with active members of the creative intelligentsia have enjoyed considerable success. A meeting of this nature, but on a republic-wide scale, was held by the CPUk Central Committee. V. V. Shcherbitskiy, first secretary of the CPUk Central Committee, held a discussion with leading figures in contemporary Ukrainian Soviet culture; it was conducted in a business-like, friendly atmosphere and, most important, it was of a constructive nature.

Conference-seminars with the participation of secretaries of party organizations of cultural and arts institutions and creative unions are held regularly. These conferences provide a forum for useful conversation on the forms and methods of party leadership for creative collectives and the best experiences of ideological, educational, and organizational work are disseminated. As a rule, materials on the seminars are published by the Ukrainian "Polizdat" publishing house, which makes them available to a broad segment of the party members.

There is an obvious interconnection between the precision, the political regulation of the ideological and thematic planning of an artistic collective, and the work of its party organization. We can offer an example of this, which happens to be of a negative nature. Quite recently the CPUR Central Committee examined the question of the work of the republic's Ministry of Culture in managing variety concert activities. It became clear that many variety concert collectives present programs of a questionable orientation, which can do ideological and esthetic harm to the education of the people. This is, of course, a result of weakened attention to this important issue on the part of the Ministry of Culture, its communist administrators, and the system's party organizations.

The system of political tempering and ideological and theoretical training for the creative intelligentsia plays a significant role in the formation of the artist's civic position and in strengthening his social activity. Party organizations of the republic's artistic collectives are devoting a great deal of attention to this work, and they are constantly concerned about its effectiveness, efficiency, and improvement.

Theoretical seminars have been implemented extensively for the instruction of literary figures and other figures in the arts. Over recent years the level of the seminars has risen markedly and the qualitative composition of the personnel engaged in propaganda has improved. Contributing substantially to this has been: the inclusion of leading social scientists in the leadership of the seminars and regular presentations by these scholars at the seminars; utilization of the most effective forms and methods for organizing instruction, such as scientific-practical conferences, individual and collective preparation of papers on pressing problems in ideological work, joint courses for the artistic intelligentsia and workers on common topics, and organization of seminars on methodological problems in the social sciences.

The experience of the theoretical conferences, discussions with many communist cultural leaders, and the desires and observations that they express, which take into account the importance and complexity of the tasks of the party's ideological and mass political activities at the contemporary stage, make it even more important in the system of political education for the artistic intelligentsia to move toward in-depth analysis and discussion of the fundamental problems in the culture of a developed socialist society, and the methodological foundations of the creative process. Of course, a well-thought out approach should be taken toward the organization of methodological seminars, taking into consideration the presence of essential conditions. We understand that haste is unacceptable here, since the important work could be compromised. Therefore, the experience of successful methodological seminars held in the Kiev organization of the Ukrainian Union of Writers is now being studied in detail.

All the party organizations of the republic's creative collectives have held important, business-like meetings; participants discussed the decisions of the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which are of immense importance for the development of socialist culture. Today communist figures in the arts are speaking out as ardent propagandists for these decisions in the press, on television and radio, and in the numerous discussions being held in production collectives. Their great personal authority, and their ability to reveal clearly and graphically the profound essence of important party documents, makes these speeches especially useful. Of course, that which has been outlined by the party and drawn from the life-giving springs of the life of the people, will find its worthy expression in new books, stage productions, films, on artists' canvases, and concert programs on a high ideological and artistic level, and in works that develop the great multi-national culture of our homeland.

BEKETOV ON WASTE OF INDUSTRIAL MATERIAL

LD041907 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Nov 83

[From the Vremya newscast; video commentary by political observer Viktor Beketov]

[Summary] Not long ago the pipe works in Severski, Sverdlovsk Oblast, received an urgent order to make -- outside the plan -- a batch of casing pipes for the Kombineft Association. Fulfillment of this order would have entailed the loss of a few hours of production and a holdup in releasing the main output. Only through exceptional efforts did the pipe workers eventually save the potential loss to the main production.

"The USSR Committee for People's Control investigated the use and storage of pipes in oil and gas industry enterprises. This resulted in the discovery of facts indicating shameful carelessness and lack of accountability." For instance, at the Bystrinskoye deposit of the Surgutneftegaz Association, a dump in a sand-pit revealed pipes discarded there over a period of 5-6 years. A total length of 17 km of casing, drilling and compressor pump pipes, as well as other parts for drilling equipment, were found in that sand-pit.

Branches of Minneftegazstroy also provided facts on bad management, although things there have been improving. And yet, 93 pipes of about 1.5 meters in diameter were found in marshlands, evidently having been discarded there after the pipeline construction ended. There are many such examples.

"What explanation is there for such an attitude to products which represent the labor of thousands of people -- steel makers, sheet metal workers, transport workers? There are many causes, but the main cause is impunity. It became clear that nobody at the storage sites keeps account of the pipes and nobody is responsible for their storage. As a rule, pipes are ordered with a big excess, sometimes two or three times more than is necessary, and then there is unwillingness to return the excess, using the excuse of lack of roads and other problems. It is so much easier to get hold of the pipes with a rope or a hitch [udavka], as the drillers say, and throw them down a slope, or in the woods, or in the marshes.

"Pipe losses also occur for other reasons, in particular, nonobservance of drilling technological regulations, which leads to various accidents; miscalculations by geologists who wrongly determine the site for drilling; defects in the pipes themselves, which should have been noticed and eliminated on the shop floor; unwillingness to engage in repair work -- instead of renewing the screw thread or change the coupling, the pipes are just thrown away."

The problem of metal economies is also involved here. This should first of all imply good management of the products already available, and the practice of strict personal accountability -- financial as well as in terms of official status -- for those who bear responsibility.

OFFICIAL NOTES DELAYS IN MACHINERY DELIVERIES

LD012204 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Dec 83

[By Vladimir Ivanovich (Yudin), chief of the Transport Directorate of the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building]

[Text] Industrial enterprise collectives are striving through shock labor to complete the current year. In 11 months 900 above-plan tractors have been produced, and targets for other machines and for spare parts have also been overfulfilled.

Collectives of the Minsk, Volgograd Tractor Works, Tselinograd Agricultural Machinery Works and the Rostov Agricultural Machinery Works have worked particularly well, but our machines and spare parts do not always reach kolkhozes and sovkhozes on time. Here are some examples:

Grain-cleaning machines are very necessary for the preparation of seeds for the sowing period, but their delivery has been brought to a standstill due to the lack of wagons. About 2,000 such machines have already come to a standstill in Voronezh. The situation concerning Volgograd tractors is even worse: 4,500 machines are awaiting dispatch on sites and streets in the vicinity of the works. Many seed drills have accumulated in the town of Kamenka in Penza Oblast. In Tula 6,000 harvesters are awaiting shipment.

Of course several months remain before the gathering of grain crops, but why should new machines be held back at a works? Preparations for the harvest should be started now and in general the dispatch of products should be regular in order not to hinder the work of enterprises. Collectives of machine building workers of our industry appeal to the leadership of the Ministry of Railways with the request to speed up the supply of wagons so that machinery for rural areas can proceed without holdups. On our part we promise to reduce the idle time of wagons to be loaded, and to continue repair work on rolling stock belonging to the Ministry of Railways.

ECONOMIST VIEWS WAYS TO IMPROVE CAPITAL USE

PMO71123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 83 First Edition p 2

[Article by E. Gorbunov, senior scientific staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute, under the "Political Discussions" rubric: "Effectiveness of Investments"]

[Text] The basic line on capital investments laid down by the 26th party congress and concretized by subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums is the mass retooling of national economic sectors. It is a course aimed at improving the system of capital investments and planning and management of scientific and technical progress.

It is a matter of improving a significant number of the technical policy planning, organization, and management criteria, the corresponding normatives (especially long-term normatives), and the methods providing for the exercise of financial autonomy with a view to radically improving the utilization of production resources, and capital construction resources especially.

This review process started with the well-known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on improving the economic machinery, which provided for an increased role for national economic plans in the implementation of the party's economic policy. However, this provision is still not being adequately implemented. In planning practice very limited use is made of measures ensuring state influence on the shaping of the macroeconomic proportions of expanded reproduction. In the investment sphere this leads to ministries including the construction of more and more new production projects in the state plan year after year, while capacities at existing enterprises are underused. Until very recently no provision at all was made for proper economic incentives to encourage retooling, and especially the replacement of operational equipment. It is therefore not surprising that the proportion of means of labor more than 15 years old is increasing at existing enterprises.

In order to enhance the role of the national economic plan in forming a national income accumulation fund of a scientifically substantiated size it would be expedient, in our opinion, to switch to planning the reproduction and technological structure of capital investments and fixed production capital on the basis of direct plan targets to be addressed to specific economic units [adresnoye planirovaniye]. Under this method the share of capital investments for new construction and for the expansion and modernization of enterprises would be laid down for ministries and departments, while production associations would have the level of the active part of their fixed production capital (equipment, machinery, and so forth) planned centrally. This approach would create an objective basis for the economically substantiated calculation of capital investment limits for the 5-year plan period and also of the specific values of the capital investment: output ratio; fixed capital; and labor productivity in terms of every sector and the national economy as a whole.

One of the top-priority measures to promote the intensification of the investment process must, in our opinion, be a one-shot stocktaking of capital construction. After all, at present no precise information is on hand about the resources available to us in the production accumulation sphere. And without this it is difficult to set in order what is at our disposal or to ensure the most sensible utilization of the country's production potential, which is what Comrade Yu.V. Andropov spoke about at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum.

How can this be done in actual fact? We could start by reviewing ministry and department capital construction portfolios, which are full of projects that are inefficient from the national economic viewpoint. The released funds could be used for retooling existing enterprises. In our view, this would create an objective precondition for better balance between the accumulation fund and capital construction programs and between the plan for construction and installation work and the capacities of corresponding organizations, on the one hand, and the resources of the construction materials industry, machine building, and so forth, on the other.

The time has clearly come to also carry out a stocktaking of uninstalled equipment that has accumulated in warehouses belonging to industrial, construction, and transport ministries and departments and within the USSR Gosstab system. This would indubitably augment the actually available equipment resources so necessary to increase production.

It is also exceptionally important to strike a better balance in plans between levels of capital investments, fixed production capital, and manpower. As yet not only at the national economy and sector levels, but even in the plans for the construction of individual projects a balance between increased investments, capital, and jobs on the one hand and the necessary manpower resources on the other hand is by no means always ensured.

In the 9th 5-Year Plan period, for instance, 2 million new jobs were created in industry, and in the 10th 5-Year Plan period, more than 1 million for which the necessary manpower could not be found.

In agriculture the "surplus" of jobs totals approximately 1 million. All this leads to the underutilization of production capacities, to their slow assimilation, and in the final analysis to a diminished return on capital and a higher capital: output ratio.

Clearly, the following rule should be adopted: Sector ministries should be obliged, when submitting capital construction plans, to account for the manpower availability at the same time. On the scale of the national economy, centralized planning of the reproduction structure of capital investments and the technological structure of fixed production capital must be dynamically linked with the manpower balance. This would mean a transition to comprehensive planning of all the production accumulation sphere's resources and would make it possible to switch the main part of material resources from new construction to the retooling of existing enterprises.

When retooling of existing capacities is carried out on a large scale, its whole point lies in ensuring that the new equipment is highly superior to the equipment it replaces. Only in this case are big capital investments rational. The following example shows how much can be gained from this. In the 9th 5-Year Plan period most of the new equipment used in cotton spinning in the USSR Ministry of Light Industry -- over three-fourths -- was channeled into replacing wornout means of labor. As a result of the retooling of enterprises with more productive machines, a 9.6-percent increase in production of cotton yarn was achieved without a substantial increase in the machine pool and with a reduction in the workforce.

This experience proves: A change in the proportions of the distribution of resources in favor of retooling can considerably enhance the efficiency of their utilization in a whole sector and within a relatively short period of time.

At present production associations' rights in the sphere of the utilization of equipment, raw material resources, and materials are being considerably extended. This demands that the monitoring and regulation of the whole process of reproduction of fixed production capital be improved.

We believe that a more differentiated approach to fixing the norms for depreciation allowances for individual types of equipment is necessary, depending on the size of the pool and the degree of its wear. If, for instance, the need for new equipment is approaching saturation point (or has passed it) it is expedient to raise the depreciation norms in order to speed up the replacement of equipment. Expanding the production development fund will help enterprises cover additional expenses for retooling by using part of the depreciation allowances earmarked for capital overhauls.

The development funds of associations and enterprises must be provided with the necessary resources (equipment, machine assemblies, spare parts, and so forth). To this end deliveries of equipment and spare parts on the basis of direct contracts between manufacturers and consumers could be more widely used, and the work of the USSR Gosstab organs could be improved. The experience accumulated by the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building in supplying ready-for-use complete manufacturing systems to enterprises under construction or in the process of modernization deserves special attention.

Enhancing the efficiency of the utilization of capital investment and fixed production capital in our national economy is one of the crucial tasks of the intensification process. It has to be tackled in a radical way, on the basis of comprehensive planning.

EARLY DEC WEATHER, CROP STATUS REPORTED

[Agrometeorologist O. Pisarenko USSR Hydrometeorological Center report: "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] At the beginning of December the weather in most of the European part of the country was changeable. In the first 5 days it was cold and wintry. Winter crops and grasses in most regions were under snow. The fields were clear of snow only in Moldavia and the southwestern regions of the Ukraine. Minimum soil temperature at tillering-node depth reached minus 2 to minus 4 degrees, and in places minus 8. In the second 5 days it was cold and wintry. Winter crops and grasses in most regions were under snow. The fields were clear of snow only in Moldavia and the southwestern regions of the Ukraine. Minimum soil temperature at tillering-node depth reached minus 2 to minus 4 degrees, and in places minus 8. In the second 5-day period it became abruptly warmer, on certain days the thermometer showed 2 to 8 degrees above zero, while in most of the Ukraine, and in Rostov Oblast and the North Caucasus it showed 9 to 15 degrees, and in the Crimea and the south Krasnodar Kray, 16 to 20 degrees.

Toward the end of the first 10-day period the snow cover disappeared in the fields in most of the Ukraine, in the Central Chernozem Zone, the south of the Central and Volga-Vyatka Regions, and the West Volga Region. In the Ukraine, Moldavia, the North Caucasus, and in the west of the Central Chernozem Zone vegetation of winter crops resumed during the daytime. North of a line linking Vilnius, Smolensk, Moscow, Gorkiy, Ulyanovsk and Saratov the snow cover remained on the fields. Its depth in the Northern Region, in the east of the Northwestern Region, in the north of the Central and Volga-Vyatka Regions, and in places in the south of the Bashkir ASSR was mainly 15 to 45 cm, and 3 to 10 cm in the other regions.

In the arable farming regions of Western Siberia and the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan the weather was unusually warm — 3 to 7 degrees warmer than usual. However, winter grain crops here were in a state of winter dormancy covered by snow 3 to 10 cm deep, and in Omsk Oblast and in the east of Novosibirsk Oblast, 11 to 30 cm deep. Minimum soil temperature at winter crop tillering-node depth stayed in the 2 to 4 degree range, and in places up to 8 degrees. The wintering of winter crops and grasses was proceeded favorably.

In the Central Asian republics, too, the weather remained unusually warm for most of the 10-day period. Air temperature was 2 to 5 degrees above normal, the maximum reached 20 to 25 degrees, with 29 degrees in the south of Turkmenia. Winter crops and grasses continued growing here throughout the entire 10-day period.

BRIEFS

NAKHICHEVAN ASSR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION — The Central Statistics Administration in Azerbaijan has reported that agricultural workers in Nakhichevan ASSR have successfully fulfilled the 1983 plan for the sale of cereals, vegetables, market-garden plants [bostan bitkileri], and fruits to the state, thus realizing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the 30th Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress, and the May and November 1982 and June 1983 Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee. The establishments of Nakhichevan ASSR have sold to the state a total of 7,008 tons of fruits, 6,008 tons of vegetables, 6,700 tons of cereals, 1,600 tons of market-garden plants, and 170 tons of potatoes. Over 46,000 tons of grapes have been sent to procurement regions and production establishments under unfavorable weather conditions. [Text] [Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0205 GMT 6 Dec 83 GF]